John Carter Brown
Library
Brown University

Nicholas Brown Junior ~~MOSES BROWN~~.

See. Page 403
for Notice of
Roger Williams' Grammar
of the Indian Tongue —

For a derivation of the word
Yan'kee — see page 60.

For a derivation of the word
Connecticut — see page 60.

Du Ponceau says that the Language
spoken by the Narragansett Tribe of Indians
is derived from the Language spoken by
the Lenni Lenape Indians who once
inhabited Pennsylvania — See page 403

see page 114 — 131 —
also 403

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

HISTORICAL & LITERARY COMMITTEE

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,

HELD AT PHILADELPHIA, FOR PROMOTING

USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

VOL. I.

Invenies illic et facta domestica vobis;
Sæpè tibi pater est, sæpè legendus avus.—Ovid.

PHILADELPHIA:
Printed and Published by Abraham Small,
No. 112, Chesnut Street,
1819.

05478a

No. II.

A

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

THE REV. JOHN HECKEWELDER,

OF BETHLEHEM,

AND

PETER S. DUPONCEAU, ESQ.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY OF THE HISTORICAL AND LITERARY COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,

RESPECTING

The Languages of the American Indians.

RPJCB

CONTENTS OF NO. II.

INTRODUCTION - - - PAGE 355

LETTER I.—Mr. Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 9th January, 1806, 357

—— II.—Dr. C. Wistar to Mr. Heckewelder, (same date) - 358

—— III.—Mr. Heckewelder to Dr. Wistar, 24th March, - 360

—— IV.—The Same to the Same, 3d April, - - 363

—— V.—Mr. Duponceau to Dr. Wistar, 14th May, - - 364

—— VI.—Dr. Wistar to Mr Heckewelder, 21st May, - 364

—— VII.—Mr. Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 27th May, 366

—— VIII.—Mr. Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 10th June, 369

—— IX.—The Same to the Same, 13th June, - - 375

—— X.—Mr. Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 20th June, - 377

—— XI.—The Same to the Same, 24th June, - - 382

—— XII.—Mr Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 13th July, 383

—— XIII.—The Same to the Same, 18th July, - - 387

—— XIV.—Mr Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 22d July, 388

—— XV.—The Same to the Same, 24th July, - - 392

—— XVI.—Mr. Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 31st July, 396

—— XVII.—The Same to the Same, 3d August, - - 402

—— XVIII.—Mr. Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 12th August, 405

—— XIX.—The Same to the Same, 15th August, - - 410

—— XX.—Mr. Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 21st August, 414

—— XXI.—Mr. Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 26th August, 422

—— XXII.—The Same to the Same, 27th August, - 427

—— XXIII.—Mr. Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 30th August, 430

—— XXIV.—Mr. Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 5th September, 436

—— XXV.—Mr. Duponceau to Mr. Heckewelder, 1st October, 441

—— XXVI.—Mr. Heckewelder to Mr. Duponceau, 10th October, 446

INTRODUCTION.

THE Historical and Literary Committee of the American Philosophical Society, desirous of taking the most effectual means to promote the objects of their institution, directed their corresponding secretary to address letters in their name to such persons in the United States as had turned their attention to similar objects, and solicit their assistance.

Among other well-informed individuals, the Reverend Mr. Heckewelder of Bethlehem was pointed out by the late Dr. Caspar Wistar, President of the Society, and one of the most active and useful members of the Committee, as a gentleman whose intimate knowledge of the American Indians, their usages, manners and languages, enabled him to afford much important aid to their labours. In consequence of this suggestion, the secretary wrote to Mr. Heckewelder the letter No. 1. and Dr. Wistar seconded his application by the letter No. 2. The languages of the Indians were not at that time particularly in the view of the Committee; the manners and customs of those nations were the principal subjects on which they wished and expected to receive information. But Mr. Heckewelder having with his letter No. 4. sent them the MS. of Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar of the Delaware Language, that communication had the effect of directing their attention to this interesting subject.

This MS. being written in German, was not intelligible to the greatest number of the members. Two of them, the Reverend Dr. Nicholas Collin, and the corresponding secretary, were particularly anxious to be honoured with

the task of translating it; but the secretary having claimed this labour as part of his official duty, it was adjudged to him. While he was translating that work, he was struck with the beauty of the grammatical forms of the Lenape idiom, which led him to ask through Dr. Wistar some questions of Mr. Heckewelder,* which occurred to him as he was pursuing his labours, and produced the correspondence now published, which was carried on by the direction and under the sanction of the Committee.

The letters which passed at the beginning between Dr. Wistar and Mr. Zeisberger, and are here published in their regular order, do not, it is true, form a necessary part of this collection; but it will be perceived, that to the two letters of Dr. Wistar, Nos. 2 and 6. we are indebted for the valuable Historical Account of the Indians, which forms the first number of this volume. It is just that he should have the credit due to his active and zealous exertions.

It was intended that Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar should have immediately followed this Correspondence, which was considered as introductory to it. But it being now evident that it would increase too much the size of the volume, its publication is for the present postponed.

* Letter V.

A CORRESPONDENCE, &c.

LETTER I.

MR. DUPONCEAU TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 9th January, 1816.

Sir—As corresponding secretary to the Historical Committee of the American Philosophical Society, it is my duty to solicit the aid of men of learning and information, by the help of whose knowledge light may be thrown on the yet obscure history of the early times of the colonization of this country, and particularly of this state. Our much respected President and common friend Dr. Wistar, has often spoken to me of the great knowledge which you possess respecting the Indians who once inhabited these parts, and of your intimate acquaintance with their languages, habits and history. He had promised me, when you was last here, to do me the favour of introducing me to you, but the bad state of his health and other circumstances prevented it, which has been and still is to me the cause of much regret. Permit me, sir, on the strength of his recommendation, and the assurance he has given me that I might rely on your zeal and patriotic feelings, to request, in the name of the Historical Committee, that you will be so good as to aid their labours by occasional communications on the various subjects that are familiar to you and which relate to the early history of this country. Accounts of the various nations of Indians which have

at different times inhabited Pennsylvania, their numbers, origin, migrations, connexions with each other, the parts which they took in the English and French wars and in the Revolutionary war, their manners, customs, languages, and religion, will be very acceptable, as well as every thing which you may conceive interesting, on a subject which at no distant period will be involved in obscurity and doubt, for want of the proper information having been given in time by those cotemporaries who now possess the requisite knowledge and are still able to communicate it. I hope, sir, that you will be able to find some moments of leisure to comply, at least in part, with this request, which you may do in any form that you may think proper. If that of occasional letters to Dr. Wistar or myself should be the most agreeable or convenient to you, you may adopt it, or any other mode that you may prefer. I beg you will favour me with an answer as soon as possible, that I may be able to inform the Committee of what they may expect from you. You may be assured that all your communications will be respectfully and thankfully received,

I am, very respectfully,
Sir,
Your most obedient humble servant,
PETER S. DUPONCEAU,
Corresponding Secretary.

LETTER II.

DR. C. WISTAR TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 9th January, 1816.

My dear Sir—Inclosed is a letter from the corresponding secretary of the Historical Committee of our Society, which will inform you of our wishes to preserve from oblivion, and to make public, all the interesting information we can procure respecting the history of our

country and its original inhabitants. I believe there is no other person now living who knows so much respecting the Indians who inhabited this part of America, as you do, and there is no one whose relations will be received with more confidence.

I hope you will approve of this method of favouring the public with your information, and we will endeavour to give you no trouble in publishing after you have favoured us with the communications. It will be particularly agreeable to the society to receive from you an account of the Lenni Lenape, as they were at the time when the settlement of Pennsylvania commenced, and of their history and misfortunes since that time; as these subjects are so intimately connected with the history of our State. The history of the Shawanese, and of the Six Nations, will be very interesting to us for the same reason. But every thing which throws light upon the nature of the Indians, their manners and customs; their opinions upon all interesting subjects, especially religion and government; their agriculture and modes of procuring subsistence; their treatment of their wives and children; their social intercourse with each other; and in short, every thing relating to them which is interesting to you, will be very instructing to the Society. A fair view of the mind and natural disposition of the savage, and its difference from that of the civilised man, would be an acceptable present to the world.

You have long been a member of the Society; may we ask of you to communicate to us what you know and think ought to be published, respecting the wild animals, or the native plants of our country. The original object of our association was to bring together gentlemen like yourself, who have a great deal of information in which the public take an interest, that they might publish it together; and while an intercourse with you will give us all great pleasure, it will perhaps be a very easy way for you to oblige the world with your knowledge, as we will

take the whole care of the publication. The information respecting our country which has been obtained by the very respectable Brethren of Bethlehem, and is contained in their archives, will, I believe, be more perfectly offered to the world by you at present, than probably it ever will afterwards by others; I therefore feel very desirous that you should engage in it.

The facts which Mr. Pyrlæus recorded there, relative to the confederation of the Six Nations, are so interesting that they ought to be made public.

In a few days after my return to Philadelphia, last autumn, I presented in your name to the Society the several books with which you favoured me. They were much gratified, for they considered them as truly valuable, and the secretary was requested to acknowledge the receipt of them, and to thank you in the name of the Society. I have constantly regretted the attack of influenza which deprived me of the pleasure of seeing more of you while you were last in Philadelphia. But I hope we shall meet again before a great while, and I shall be sincerely pleased if I can execute any of your commissions here, or serve you in any way; my brother joins me in assuring you of our best wishes, and of the pleasure we derived from your society,

With these I remain,
Your sincere friend,
C. WISTAR.

LETTER III.

MR. HECKEWELDER TO DR. WISTAR.

Bethlehem, 24th March, 1816.

My dear Sir—Last evening I was favoured with a letter from you, covering one from the corresponding secretary of the Historical Committee of the American

Philosophical Society, dated 9th January, and a book, for which I return my best thanks. If an apology for not having written to you since I left Philadelphia can be admitted, it must be that of my having been engaged in all my leisure hours, in completing my narrative of the Mission, a work of which, even if it is never published, I wished for good reasons, to leave a manuscript copy. I have now got through with the principal part, but have to copy the whole text, and in part to write the notes, remarks, and anecdotes which are intended for the appendix. While writing, it has sometimes struck me, that there might probably be some interesting passages in the work, as the speeches of Indians on various occasions; their artful and cunning ways of doing at times business; I had almost said their diplomatic manœuvres as politicians; their addresses on different occasions to the Great Spirit, &c. which are here noticed in their proper places. I think much of the true character of the Indian may be met with in perusing this work, and I will endeavour to forward the narrative to you and your brother for perusal, after a little while.

Were I still in the possession of all the manuscripts which I gave to my friend the late Dr. Barton, it would be an easy matter for me to gratify you and the Philosophical Society in their wishes, but having retained scarcely any, or but very few copies of what I sent him, I am not so able to do what I otherwise would with pleasure; I shall, however, make it my study to do what I can yet, though I am aware that I shall in some points, differ from what others have said and written. I never was one of those hasty believers and writers, who take the shadow for the substance: what I wished to know, I always wished to know correctly.

I approve of the mode proposed by the secretary of the Historical Committee, to make communications in the form of letters, which is for me the easiest and quickest mode. In the same way Dr. Barton received much in-

teresting matter from me within the last 20 or 60 years. He often told me that he would publish a book, and make proper use of my communications. Had he not told me this so repeatedly, I should long since have tried to correct many gross errors, written and published, respecting the character and customs of the Indians. The Lenni Lenape, improperly called the Delawares, I shall, according to their tradition, trace across the Mississippi into this country, set forth what people they were, what parts of the country they inhabited, and how they were brought down to such a low state: perhaps, never did man take the pains that I did for years, to learn the true causes of the decline of that great and powerful nation.

The Grammar of the Language of the Lenni Lenape, written by David Zeisberger, is still in my hands. By his will it is to be deposited in the Brethrens' Archives in Bethlehem, but he has not prohibited taking a copy of it. Will it be of any service to the Society that it should be sent down for a few months for perusal, or if thought necessary, to take a copy? If so, please to let me know, and I shall send it with pleasure. It is, however, German and Indian, and without a translation will be understood but by few. I may perhaps find other documents interesting to the Society, as for example, copies of letters on Indian business and treaties, of which many are in the possession of Joseph Horsfield, Esq. son of the late Timothy Horsfield, through whom they have come into his hands, and who is willing to communicate them.* I am, dear friend,

Your's sincerely,
J. HECKEWELDER.

P. S. Will you be so good as with my respects to mention to the secretary that I have received his letter, and shall shortly answer it—my best wishes also to your brother Richard, whom I highly esteem. J. H.

* These papers have been communicated.

LETTER IV.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

Bethlehem, 3d April, 1816.

My dear Friend—With Captain Mann, of your city, I send David Zeisberger's Grammar of the Language of the Lenni Lenape, (otherwise called the Delaware Indians.) As the book is not mine, but left by will, to be placed in the Library at Bethlehem, I can do no more than send it for perusal; or, if wished for, to have a copy taken from it, which, indeed, I myself would cheerfully have done for you, were it not that I must spare my weak eyes as much as possible.

I believe I have closed my last letter to you, without answering to the question you put to me, respecting, "wild animals and the native plants of our country." On this head I do not know that I could be of any service, since the animals that were in this country on the arrival of the Europeans must be pretty generally known; and respecting the native plants, I do not consider myself qualified to give any information, as all I have attended to, has been to collect plants for botanists, leaving it to them to examine and class them. But my friend Dr. Kampman of this place, who is, I believe, one of the most attentive gentlemen to botany, has promised me for you a copy of the botanical names of those plants which he, and a few others of his friends, have collected, within a great number of years, in the Forks of Delaware, with some few from New Jersey, to the number (he thinks) of about five hundred; all which plants are in nature carefully laid up by him. Probably in two or three weeks, I shall have the pleasure of transmitting to you this promised catalogue. I am, &c.

LETTER V.

FROM MR. DUPONCEAU TO DR. WISTAR.

Philadelphia, 14th May, 1816.

DEAR SIR—When you write to your friend Mr. Heckewelder, I beg you will request him to answer the following questions:

1. What name did the French give to the Delaware nation?

2. I find in Zeisberger's Vocabulary, page 11, that *Gischuch* means the *sun.* In the Grammar, I see that the Delawares divide their year by moons, and call them *anixi gischuch,* &c. So that *gischuch* signifies *moon* as well as *sun,* how is it?

3. I find in the Grammar that the pronoun *nekama* or *neka* means *he,* but it does not appear to have any feminine. What is the proper word for *she* in the Delaware, and how is it declined? I am, &c.

LETTER VI.

FROM DR. WISTAR TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, May 21st, 1816.

MY DEAR FRIEND—I am much obliged by your kind letters, which are very interesting, and will, I hope, obtain from us some of the valuable information which has been left unpublished by our ingenious colleague the late Dr. Barton. The Grammar of your venerable friend, Zeisberger, is regarded by Mr. Duponceau as a treasure. He thinks the inflections of the Indian verbs so remarkable that they will attract the general attention of the Literati. Inclosed is a letter from him, by which he

expects to open a correspondence with you on the subject. I will be much obliged by your writing to him as soon as your convenience will permit.

We expect soon to have materials for publishing a volume of Historical Documents, and I have proposed that we shall prefix to those which relate to Pennsylvania, all the information we can collect respecting the Indians who were here before our ancestors. The Committee agree that this will be the proper method, and my dependance for authentic information is on you; as I have never met with any person who had any knowledge to compare with yours, respecting the poor Indians. I was delighted to find that your enquiries have been directed to the history of the Lenni Lenape before they settled in Pennsylvania. The removal of the Indian tribes from our country to another is a very interesting subject. If you can tell us where they came from and what forced them away; who were here before them, and what induced their predecessors to make war for them, we shall be much obliged to you. There is no book I shall read with more pleasure than yours.

The causes of their downfal, I believe, are well known to you, and will of course have a place. The manner in which they were treated by the Six Nations, after their conquest, will be an interesting article, as it will show the Indian policy. An account of the political rights which were still allowed them, and, in short, of every thing which is connected with their conquest, will add to the interest of the work. As occupants of Pennsylvania before the Whites, ought not the Shawanese and the Six Nations also to be described?

I have been told that the Shawanese were more refined than any other Indians in this part of America, and that the place where Chilicothe now stands, was the seat of Indian civilisation.

I have the pleasure of forwarding to you an instructing work by Dr. Drake, a physician at Cincinnati, which he sends you.

He also sends a small package and a letter to Mr. Steinhauer.

I send them by a wagon which goes from Mr. Bolling's, but I am not without some expectation of paying another visit to Bethlehem very soon, where it will be a great gratification to meet with my friend.

Affectionately your's,
CASPAR WISTAR.

LETTER VII.

MR. HECKEWELDER TO MR. DUPONCEAU.

Bethlehem, 27th May, 1816.

Dear Sir—I was this morning favoured with a letter from my friend Dr. Wistar, inclosing some questions which you wish me to answer. I lose no time in complying with your desire.

Your first question is, "what name the French did give "to the Delaware nation?"

I believe the Baron de La Hontan meant them when he spoke of the Algonkins, whom he describes as a people whose language was understood by many nations or tribes. So is certainly that of the Delawares.

While I was residing on the Muskingum, between the years 1773 and 1781, I cannot precisely remember the year, there came a French gentleman who was travelling on some business among the different Indian tribes, and could speak more or less of several Indian languages, among which was that of the Delawares. I had much conversation with him respecting the Indians, and observed that he called the Delawares *les Lenopes*, (a word evidently derived from their real name *Lenni Lenape.*) He told me that the language of that nation had a wide range, and that by the help of it, he had travelled more

than a thousand miles among different Indian nations, by all of whom he was understood. He added, that the Baron La Hontan, when speaking of the Algonkins, must either have alluded to that nation, or to some one descended from them. In other instances, in the course of the four years that I resided in Upper Canada, I generally heard the French Canadians call them Lénópé, while the English called them Delawares. Nevertheless, I do not doubt but that they have been called by different names by the French and other travellers, and if my memory serves me, some of the French people called them *les Loups*, a name probably derived from one of their tribes called the *Wolf*, if it is not a corruption of Lenape or Lenope.

Your next question is, "whether the Delaware word "*gischuch*, signifies the sun or moon, or both together?" The Indian name "*gischuch*," is common to "the two great luminaries which send down light from above." The moon is called "*nipawi gischuch*," as it were "the "sun which gives light in the night." It is also called in one word "*nipahum*." "*Gischuch*," singly, is often used for the moon; the Indian year is divided into thirteen lunar months, and in this sense, the word "*gischuch*," is used; as for instance, "*schawanáki gischuch*," or, in the Minsi or Monsey dialect, "*chwani gischuch*," the *shad moon*, answering to the month which we call March, at which time the fish called "shad" passes from the sea into the fresh water rivers. The inferior "stars" have a different name; they are called in the singular *alank*; plural, *alankewak*, and by contraction, *alanquak*.

Lastly, you ask whether the Delawares have a word answering to the English personal pronoun "*she*," and what it is? I beg leave to answer you somewhat in detail.

In the Indian languages, those discriminating words or inflections which we call *genders*, are not, as with us, in general, intended to distinguish between male and fe-

male beings, but between animate and inanimate things or substances. Trees and plants (annual plants and grasses excepted) are included within the generic class of animated beings. Hence the personal pronoun has only two modes, if I can so express myself, one applicable to the animate and the other to the inanimate gender; "*nekama*" is the personal pronominal form which answers to "he" and "she" in English. If you wish to distinguish between the sexes, you must add to it the word "man" or "woman." Thus "*nekama lenno*," means "*he*" or "*this man*;" "*nekama ochqueu*," "*she*" or "*this woman*." This may appear strange to a person exclusively accustomed to our forms of speech, but I assure you that the Indians have no difficulty in understanding each other.

Nor must you imagine that their languages are poor. See how the Delaware idiom discriminates between the different ages of man and woman!

Lenno, *a man.*
Wuskilenno, *a young man.*
Pilapeu, *a lad.*
Pilawesis, or pilawétzitsch, *a boy.*
Pilawétit, *a male infant babe.*
Kigeyilenno, *an aged man.*
Mihilusis, *an old man, worn out with age.*
Ochqueu, *a woman.*
Wusdóchqueu, *a young woman, a virgin.*
Ochquetschitsch, *a girl.*
Quetit, *a female infant babe.*
Gichtochqueu, *an aged woman.*
Chauchschìsis, *a very old woman.*

Note "*len*" or "*lenno*" in the male, and "*que*" or "*queu*" in the female, distinguish the sexes in compound words; sometimes the *L* alone denotes the male sex, as in "pi*l*apeu," "mihi*l*usis," &c.

The males of quadrupeds are called *lenno wéchum*," and by contraction "*lennochum*," the females "*Ochque wéchum*," and by contraction "*ochquéchum*," which is

the same as saying *he* or *she* beasts. With the winged tribe, their generic denomination "*wehelle*" is added to the word which expresses the sex, thus, "*lenno wehelle*" for the male, and "*ochquechelle*" (with a little contraction) for the female. There are some animals the females of which have a particular distinguishing name, as "*Nunschetto*" a *doe*, "*Nunscheach*" a *she bear*. This, however, is not common.

Thus I have endeavoured to answer your questions, and I hope, have done it to your satisfaction. I shall always be willing and ready to give you any further information that you or the Philosophical Society may require; I mean, always to the best of my knowledge and abilities, I am, &c.

LETTER VIII.

MR. DUPONCEAU TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 10th June, 1816.

Dear Sir—Your favour of the 27th ult. has done me the greatest pleasure. I am very thankful for the goodness you have had to answer the questions which I took the liberty of putting to you through our common friend Dr. Wistar. I shall not fail to avail myself of your kind offer to answer such further questions as I may ask, as in so doing I shall fulfil a duty which the Historical Committee of the Philosophical Society has imposed upon me, and at the same time I am satisfied that I shall derive a great deal of pleasure to myself. But I must acknowledge that I am entirely ignorant of the subject on which I have been directed to obtain information from you, so much so that I am even at a loss what questions to ask. As I have,

however, undertaken the task, I must endeavour to go through it as well as I can, and rely on the instruction which I shall receive from your letters, to point out to me further enquiries. I am fortunately employed in translating the late Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar of the Lenni Lenape, which will lead me a little into the right path, and I read at the same time such books as I can find in our scanty libraries respecting the languages of the American Indians. This study pleases me much, as I think I perceive many beauties in those idioms, but the true enjoyment of those beauties is, I presume, only accessible to those to whom the languages are familiar.

From what I have above stated, you will easily perceive that my questions to you must necessarily be desultory and without any regular order or method. But you will diffuse light through this chaos, and every thing at last will find its proper place.

I cannot express to you how delighted I am with the grammatical forms of the Indian languages, particularly of the Delaware, as explained by Mr. Zeisberger. I am inclined to believe that those forms are peculiar to this part of the world, and that they do not exist in the languages of the old hemisphere. At least, I am confident that their developement will contribute much to the improvement of the science of universal grammar. About fifty years ago, two eminent French Philosophers published each a short treatise on the origin of language. One of them was the celebrated mathematician Maupertuis, and the other M. Turgot, who afterwards was made a minister of state and acquired considerable reputation by his endeavours to introduce reform into the administation of the government of his own country. M. Maupertuis, in his Essay, took great pains to shew the necessity of studying the languages even of the most distant and barbarous nations, "because," said he, "we may "chance to find some that are formed on *new plans of* "*ideas.*" M. Turgot, instead of acknowledging the just-

ness of this profound remark, affected to turn it into ridicule, and said he could not understand what was meant by "*plans of ideas.*" If he had been acquainted with the Delaware language, he would have been at no loss to comprehend it.

I presume that by this expression M. Maupertuis meant the various modes in which ideas are combined and associated together in the form of words and sentences, and in this sense it is to me perfectly intelligible. The associations expressed by words must be first formed in the mind, and the words shew in what order of succession the ideas were conceived, and in what various groups they arranged themselves before utterance was given to them. The variety of those groups which exists in the different languages forms what M. Maupertuis meant by "plans of ideas," and indeed, this variety exists even in one and the same language. Thus when we say, "lover," and "he who loves," the same group of ideas is differently combined, and of course, differently expressed, and it may well be said that those ideas are arranged "on different plans."

This difference is strongly exemplified in the Delaware language; I shall only speak at present of what we call the "declension of nouns." What in our European idioms we call the "objective cases" are one or more words expressive of two prominent ideas, that of the object spoken of, and that of the manner in which it is affected by some other object or action operating upon it. This is done in two ways; by inflecting the substantive, or by affixing to it one or more of those auxiliary words which we call "prepositions." Thus when we say in English "*of Peter*," and in German "*Peters*," the same two principal ideas are expressed in the former language by two words and in the latter by one, and the termination or inflexion *s* in German conveys the same meaning as the preposition "*of*" in English. It is clear that these two ideas, before they were uttered in the form of words, were

grouped in the minds both of the German and the Englishman; in the one, as it were at once, and in the other successively: for it is natural to suppose that they were conceived as they are expressed. Again, when you say in Latin *amo Petrum*, (I love Peter) the termination *um* is expressive of the action of the verb *love*, upon the object, *Peter*. In the English and German this accessary idea is not expressed by sound, but still it exists in the mind. In every language, there are more ideas, perhaps, understood, than are actually expressed. This might be easily demonstrated, if it were here the place.

Let us now consider how the same ideas are combined and expressed in the Delaware language, according to Mr. Zeisberger. When the accessary idea which we call "*case*" proceeds from the operation of a verb upon a noun or word significant of an object, that idea is not affixed as with us to the noun but to the verb, or in other words, it is not the *noun* but the *verb* that is declined by inflexions or cases. Thus when you say "*getannitowit n'quitayala*, I fear God;" the first word, *getannitowit*, which is the substantive, is expressed, as we should say, in the nominative case, while the termination of the verb *yala*, expresses its application to the object. It is precisely the same as if in Latin, instead of saying, *Petrum amo*, I love Peter, we carried the termination *um* to the verb, and said *Petrus amum*. Does not this shew that many various combinations of ideas may take place in the human mind, of which we, Europeans by birth or descent, have not yet formed a conception? Does this not bid defiance to our rules or canons of universal grammar, and may we not say with M. Maupertuis, that in extending our study of the languages of man, we shall probably find some formed upon "plans of ideas" different from our own?

But I perceive that instead of asking you questions, as it is my duty to do, I am losing myself in metaphysical disquisitions; I return, then, to my principal object. A

very interesting German book has lately fallen into my hands. It is entitled "*Untersuchungen ueber Amerikas bevœlkerung aus dem alten Kontinente,*"* and it is written by Professor Vater, of Leipzig. The author, after justly observing that the language of the Delawares is exceedingly rich in grammatical forms, and making the same observation on that of the Naticks, from the venerable Elliott's translation of the Bible into that idiom, says that, on the contrary, that of the Chippeways is very poor in that respect. "*Die Chippewœer,*" he says, "*haben fast keine formen.*"† This appears to me very strange, because on examining the various Indian languages from Nova Scotia to Chili, I have been surprised to find that they appear all formed on the same model, and if Professor Vater is correct, the Chippeway dialect will form an exception. I beg, therefore, you will inform me whether there is such a great difference as he states between that and the Delaware. I am much inclined to think that the learned Professor is mistaken. I must take this opportunity, however, to express my astonishment at the great knowledge which the Literati of Germany appear to possess of America, and of the customs, manners and languages of its original inhabitants. Strange! that we should have to go to the German universities to become acquainted with our own country.

Another German Professor, of the name of Rudiger, has compiled an interesting work, in which he gives specimens of all the languages in the world, as far as they are known, and among them does not forget those of the Indian nations of America. He gives the numerals of the Delaware language, from a vocabulary of that idiom, printed at Stockholm, in 1696, and made while the Swedes were in possession of that part of this country which they principally inhabited. I find a considerable difference

* An Enquiry into the Question, whether America was peopled from the Old Continent?

† The Chippeways have hardly any grammatical forms.

between those numerals and these given by Zeisberger. That you may see in what it consists, I insert them both.

DELAWARE NUMERALS.

According to the Swedish Vocabulary.	According to Zeisberger.
1, Ciutte.	1, Ngutti.
2, Nissa.	2, Nischa.
3, Naha.	3, Nacha.
4, Nawo.	4, Newo.
5, Pareenach.	5, Palenach.
6, Ciuttas.	6, Guttasch.
7, Nissas.	7, Nischasch.
8, Haas.	8, Chasch.
9, Pæschun.	9, Peschkonk.
10, Thæræn.	10, Tellen.
20, Nissinacke.	20, Nischinachke.
100, Ciutabpach.	100, Nguttapachki.

Now, there can be no doubt that these two sets of numerals belongs to the same language, but I am astonished at seeing the same words written so differently by a Swede and a German, when there is so little difference in the powers of the alphabetical signs of their languages. I am particularly struck with some words that are written with *R* by the Swede and with *L* by the German author. In all Zeisberger's Grammar I have not been able to find the letter *R* in one single Delaware word, neither is it to be found in any of the words of his Delaware spelling book. No doubt you can inform me of the reason of this difference.

A greater one is still to be found in the Algonkin numerals given by the Baron La Hontan, and those of the Delaware proper. I place them here again in opposition to each other.

Algonkin numerals from La Hontan.	Delaware numerals from Zeisberger.
1, Pegik.	1, Ngutti.
2, Ninch.	2, Nischa.
3, Nissoue.	3, Nacha.
4, Neou.	4, Newo.
5, Narau.	5, Palenach.
6, Ningoutouassou.	6, Guttasch.
7, Ninchouassou.	7, Nischasch.
8, Nissouassou.	8, Chasch.
9, Changassou.	9, Peschkonk.
10, Mitassou.	10, Tellen.

There is certainly a family resemblance between some of these words, while in others no kind of similarity can be traced. As you believe that the Delawares and the Algonkins are the same people, I beg you will be so good as to point out to me the cause of the difference which I have observed. I am, &c.

LETTER IX.

FROM THE SAME TO THE SAME.

Philadelphia, 13th June, 1816.

DEAR SIR—I take the liberty of submitting to you a few questions, which have occurred to me in perusing Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar. I beg you will be so good as to answer them at your leisure, I am, &c.

QUERIES.

1. In Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar, double consonants are frequently used, as in *Pommauchsin, Lenno, Lenni Lenape.*

QUÆRE: Are the two consonants fully and distinctly sounded, thus: *pom-m-auchsin—Len-n-o,* as in the Italian language, or is only one of the consonants heard, as

if it were thus written: *pomauchsin, leno.* In this latter case what is the reason for using two consonants, if only one is sounded?

2. Mr. Zeisberger frequently puts a comma or apostrophe (') before or after the letter N in the present of the indicative verbs, *'npommauchsi,* and sometimes *n'pommauchsi.* Sometimes he writes the word without: *ndappiwi, ndappiwitsch;* what is the reason of this variation? Is there any necessity for the comma before or after the *N* in the first person, or after the *K* and *W,* in the second and third? Is it not best to simplify as much as possible the orthography of such a difficult language?

3. What is the difference in pronunciation between *ke* and *que;* say, *pomauchsijenke* and *pomauchsijeque?* Is the latter sounded like *cue* or *kue,* or is it sounded as *ke?*

4. The conjunctive mood is expressed in German by "*wenn;*" does it mean in English "*if*" or "*when?* Does "*n'pomauchsijane,*" mean "when I live" or "if I live," or both? I find it sometimes expressed "*wenn,*" oder "*da,*" oder "*als,*" which inclines me to think it signifies both "*when*" and "*if.*"

5. I find some terminations in the tenses of the verbs, sometimes written "*cup,*" sometimes "*kup,*" and sometimes "*gup;*" thus *epiacup,* "where I was," *elsijakup,* "when or if I was so situated;" and *pommauchsijengup,* "if "or when we have lived." Are these different sounds, or does this difference in writing arise from the Germans being accustomed to confound the sounds of K and G hard?

6. I find some words written sometimes with one *I* and sometimes with two; thus *elsia,* and *elsija.* Are the two *i*'s separately articulated, or do they sound only as one?

7. I find the second person of the singular in verbs sometimes written with a *K,* sometimes with a *G,* thus *kneichgussi,* du wirst gesehen (thou art seen); *kdaantschi,* du wirst gehen; (thou wilt go), *gemilgussi,* dir wird gege-

ben (it is given to thee.) Why is it not written *kemil-gussi?* see query 5. I find sometimes a double *aa*—Is it merely to express length of quantity, or are the two *a*'s sounded distinctly?

8. What is the difference in sound been *ch* and *hh*, do they both represent the same guttural sound like *ch* in German? If so, why express this sound in two different ways; if otherwise, what is the real difference between the two sounds?

EXAMPLES.

A*ch*pil, bl*ei*be du (remain thou); a*ch*pi*ch*tique, wenn sie nicht da sind (if they are not there); nda*hh*enap, wir waren gegangen (we had gone); kda*hh*imo, ihr gehet (you go.) I am, &c.

LETTER X.

MR. HECKEWELDER TO MR. DUPONCEAU.

Bethlehem, 20th June, 1816.

Dear Sir—Your favours of the 10th and 13th inst. have been duly received. I shall now endeavour to answer the first. The second shall in a few days be attended to.

I am glad to find that you are so much pleased with the forms of our Indian languages. You will be still more so as you become more familiar with the beautiful idiom of the Lenni Lenape. It is certain that many of those forms are not to be found either in the German or English; how it is with the other languages of Europe, Asia, and Africa, I cannot say, not being acquainted with them, and never having made philology my particular study. I concur with you in the opinion that there must be in the world many different ways of connecting ideas

together in the form of words, or what we call *parts of speech*, and that much philosophical information is to be obtained by the study of those varieties. What you observe with regard to the verbs being inflected in lieu of affixing a case or termination to the noun is very correct, but the ground or principle on which it is done, is not perhaps known to you. The verbs in the Indian languages are susceptible of a variety of forms, which are not to be found in any other language that I know. I do not mean to speak here of the positive, negative, causative, and a variety of other forms, but of those which Mr. Zeisberger calls *personal*, in which the two pronouns, governing and governed, are by means of affixes, suffixes, terminations and inflexions, included in the same word. Of this I shall give you an instance from the Delaware language. I take the verb *ahoalan*, to love, belonging to the fifth of the eight conjugations, into which Mr. Zeisberger has very properly divided this part of speech.

INDICATIVE, PRESENT, POSITIVE.

Singular.	*Plural.*
N'dahoala, *I love,*	n'dahoalaneen, *we love,*
k'dahoala, *thou* —	k'dahoalohhimo, *you* —
w'dahoala, } *he* —	ahoalewak, *they* —
or ahoaleu }	

Now for the personal forms in the same tense.

FIRST PERSONAL FORM.

I.

Singular.	*Plural.*
K'dahoatell, *I love thee,*	K'dahoalohhumo, *I love you,*
n'dahoala, *I love him or her.*	n'dahoalawak, — *them.*

SECOND PERSONAL FORM.

Thou.

Singular.	*Plural.*
K'dahoali, *thou lovest me,*	k'dahoalineen, *thou lovest us,*
k'dahoala, — *him or her.*	k'dahoalawak, — *them.*

THIRD PERSONAL FORM.

HE, (*or* SHE.)

Singular.	*Plural.*
N'dahoaluk, *he loves me,*	w'dahoalguna, *he loves us,*
k'dahoaluk, — *thee,*	w'dahoalguwa, — *you,*
w'dahoalawall — *him.*	w'dahoalawak, — *them,*

FOURTH PERSONAL FORM.

WE.

Singular.	*Plural.*
K'dahoalenneen, *we love thee,*	k'dahoalohummena, *we love you,*
n'dahoalawuna, — *him.*	n'dahoalowawuna, — *them.*

FIFTH PERSONAL FORM.

YOU.

Singular.	*Plural.*
K'dahoalihhimo, *you love me,*	k'dahoalihhena, *you love us,*
k'dahoalanewo, — *him.*	k'dahoalawawak, — *them.*

SIXTH PERSONAL FORM.

THEY.

Singular.	*Plural.*
N'dahoalgenewo, *they love me,*	n'dahoalgehhena, *they love us,*
k'dahoalgenewo, — *thee,*	k'dahoalgehhimo, — *you,*
w'dahoalanewo, — *him.*	w'dahoalawawak, — *them.*

In this manner verbs are conjugated through all their moods and tenses, and through all their negative, causative and various other forms, with fewer irregularities than any other language that I know of.

These conjugations, no doubt, you have found, or will find in Mr. Zeisberger's grammar, but the few examples

that I have above put together, are necessary to understand the explanation which I am about to give.

The words you quote are: "*getannitowit n'quitayala,*" *I fear God,* or rather, according to the Indian inversion, *God I fear.* Your observation is that the inflexion or case of the noun substantive *God,* is carried to the verb. This is true; but if you inquire for the reason or the manner in which it takes place, you will find that *ala* is the inflexion of the second or last person of the verb, in the first personal form; thus as you have seen that *n'dahoala* means *I love him,* so *n'quitayala,* in the same form and person means *I fear him;* it is therefore the same as if you said *God I fear him.* This is not meant in the least to doubt or dispute the correctness of your position, but to shew in what manner the combination of ideas is formed that has led to this result. You have now, I believe, a wider field for your metaphysical disquisitions.

I pass on to the other parts of your letter. I believe with you that Professor Vater is mistaken in his assertion that the language of the Chippeways is deficient in grammatical forms. I am not skilled in the Chippeway idiom, but while in Upper Canada, I have often met with French Canadians and English traders who understood and spoke it very well. I endeavoured to obtain information from them respecting that language, and found that it much resembled that of the Lenape. The differences that I observed were little more than some variations in sound, as *b* for *p,* and *i* for *u.* Thus in the Delaware *wapachquiwan* means a *blanket,* in the Chippeway it is *wabewian; gischuch* is Delaware for a *star,* the Chippeways say *gischis; wape* in Delaware *white;* in the Chippeway, *wabe.* Both nations have the word *Mannitto* for God, or the Great Spirit, a word which is common to all the nations and tribes of the Lenape stock.

There is no doubt that the Chippeways, like the Mahicanni, Naticks, Wampanos, Nanticokes, and many

other nations, are a branch of the great family of the Lenni Lenape, therefore I cannot believe that there is so great a difference in the forms of their languages from those of the mother tongue. I shall, however, write on the subject to one of our Missionaries who resides in Canada, and speaks the Chippeway idiom, and doubt not that in a short time I shall receive from him a full and satisfactory answer.

On the subject of the numerals, I have had occasion to observe that they sometimes differ very much in languages derived from the same stock. Even the Minsi, a tribe of the Lenape or Delaware nation, have not all their numerals like those of the Unami tribe, which is the principal among them. I shall give you an opportunity of comparing them.

Numerals of the Minsi.	Numerals of the Unami.
1, Gutti.	1, N'gutti.
2, Nischa.	2, Nischa.
3, Nacha.	3, Nacha.
4, Newa.	4, Newo.
5, *Nalan*, (algonk. *narau.*)	5, Palenach.
6, Guttasch.	6, Guttasch.
7, *Nischoasch*, (algonk. *nissouassou.*)	7, Nischasch.
8, Chaasch.	8, Chasch.
9, *Nolewi.*	9, *Peschkonk.*
10, *Wimbat.*	10, *Tellen.*

You will easily observe that the numbers five and ten in the Minsi dialect, resemble more the Algonkin as given by La Hontan, than the pure Delaware. I cannot give you the reason of this difference. To this you will add the numerous errors committed by those who attempt to write down the words of the Indian languages, and who either in their own have not alphabetical signs adequate to the true expression of the sounds, or want an *Indian ear* to distinguish them. I could write a volume on the subject of their ridiculous mistakes. I am, &c.

LETTER XI.

FROM MR. HECKEWELDER.

Bethlehem, 24th June, 1818.

DEAR SIR—I now proceed to answer the several queries contained in your letter of the 13th inst.

1. The double consonants are used in writing the words of the Delaware language, for the sole purpose of indicating that the vowel which immediately precedes them is short, as in the German words *immer*, *nimmer*, *schimmer*, and the English *fellow*, *terrible*, *ill*, *butter*, &c. The consonant is not to be articulated twice.

2. The apostrophe which sometimes follows the letters *n* and *k*, is intended to denote the contraction of a vowel, as *n'pommauchsi*, for *ni pommauchsi*, *n'dappiwi*, for *ni dappiwi*, &c. If Mr. Zeisberger has placed the apostrophe in any case before the consonant, he must have done it through mistake.

3. There is a difference in pronunciation between *ke* and *que;* the latter is pronounced like *kue* or *kwe*. In a verb, the termination *ke* indicates the first person of the plural, and *que* the second.

4. The word *wenn*, employed in the German translation of the tenses of the conjunctive mood of the Delaware verbs, means both *when*,and *if*, and is taken in either sense according to the content of the phrase in which the word is used. Examples: *Ili gachtingetsch pommauchsiane*, "IF I live until the next year"—*Payane Philadelphia*, "WHEN I come to Philadelphia."

5. Sometimes the letters *c* or *g*, are used in writing the Delaware language instead of *k*, to shew that this consonant is not pronounced too hard; but in general *c* and *g* have been used as substitutes for *k*, because our printers had not a sufficient supply of types for that character.

6. Where words are written with *ij*, both the letters are to be articulated; the latter like the English *y* before a vowel. For this reason in writing Delaware words I often employ the *y* instead of *j*, which Mr. Zeisberger and the German Missionaries always make use of. Thus *Elsija* is to be pronounced like *Elsiya*.

7. Answered in part above, No. 5. The double vowels are merely intended to express length of sound, as in the German.

8. *Ch*, answers to the X of the Greeks, and *ch* of the Germans. *Hh*, like all other duplicated consonants, indicates only the short sound of the preceding vowel.

I am, &c.

LETTER XII.

TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 13th July, 1816.

Dear Sir—I have received your kind letters of the 20th and 24th ult. It is impossible to be more clear, precise, and accurate, than you are in your answers to my various questions. The information which your letters contain is of the highest interest to me, and I doubt not will prove so to the Committee, by whose orders I have engaged in this Correspondence, on a subject entirely new to me, but with which I hope in time and with your able assistance, to become better acquainted.

M. de Volney has said somewhere in his excellent Descriptive View of the United States, that it were to be wished that five or six eminent linguists should be constantly employed at the public expense to compile Indian Grammars and Dictionaries. I cannot suppose that the Count meant literally what he said, as he must have been

sensible of the difficulties attending on the execution of such a plan, but at any rate, here is a noble display of enthusiasm for our favourite science, and a sufficient encouragement for us to pursue our philological enquiries. Alas! if the beauties of the Lenni Lenape language were found in the ancient Coptic, or in some ante-diluvian Babylonish dialect, how would the learned of Europe be at work to display them in a variety of shapes and raise a thousand fanciful theories on that foundation! What superior wisdom, talents and knowledge would they not ascribe to nations whose idioms were formed with so much skill and method! But who cares for the poor American Indians? They are savages and barbarians and live in the woods; must not their languages be savage and barbarous like them?

Thus reason those pretended philosophers who court fame by writing huge volumes on the origin of human language, without knowing, perhaps, any language but their own, and the little Latin and Greek that they have been taught at College. You would think, when you read their works, that they had lived in the first ages of the creation and had been intimately acquainted with the family of our first parents. They know exactly what words were first uttered when men began to communicate their ideas to each other by means of articulated sounds; they can tell you how the various parts of speech, in perfect regular order, were successively formed, and with a little encouragement, they would, I have no doubt, compile a Grammar and Dictionary of the primitive language, as one Psalmanazar did once in England of a supposed Formosan tongue. It is a pity, indeed, that the Delawares, the Wyandots and the Potowatamies, with languages formed on a construction which had not been before thought of, come to destroy their beautiful theories. What then? are we to suppress the languages of our good Indians, or to misrepresent them, that the existing systems on Universal Grammar

and the origin of language may be preserved? No, my friend, we shall on the contrary, I hope, labour with all our might to make them known, and provide, at least, additional facts for future theorists.

I have been led into this chain of ideas by reading the ponderous work of a Scotch Lord named Monboddo, who has dreamt of languages more than any other writer that I know. On the authority of a Father Sagard, (a French Missionary) he represents the language of the Hurons as the most incoherent and unsystematical heap of vocables that can possibly be conceived. Their words have no regular formation or derivation, no roots or radical syllables, there is no analogy whatever in the construction or arrangement of this language. He says, for instance, that there is a word for "two years" entirely different from those which signify one, three, four or ten years; that "*hut*," "*my hut*," and "*in my hut*," are severally expressed by words entirely different from each other. He adduces several other examples of the same kind, with which I shall not trouble you, and concludes with saying, that "the Huron language is the most im-"perfect of any that has been yet discovered." (Orig. of Lang. Vol. I. p. 478.)

Before we proceed further, let us suppose that a Huron or a Delaware is writing a treatise on the origin of language, and in the pride of pompous ignorance attempts to make similar observations on the English idiom. Following Lord Monboddo's course of reasoning, he will say: "The English is the most imperfect language upon "earth, for its words have no kind of analogy to each "other. They say, for instance "*a house*," and the things "that belong to a house they call "*domestic*." They say "*a year*," and "an *annual* payment," for a sum of mo-"ney payable every *year*. That is not all; if the pay-"ment is to be made in *two* years, it is then called *bien-"nial*, in which you find no trace of either the word *two* "or the word "*year*," of which in a regular language it

"should be compounded. What belongs to a *King* is "royal; to a *woman*, feminine; to a *ship*, naval; to a "*town*, urban; to the *country*, rural. Such another ir- "regular, unmethodical dialect never existed, I believe, "on the back of the great tortoise!!"

Such would be the language of our Huron philosopher, and he would be about as right as Lord Monboddo. I have read this work of Father Sagard, of which there is a copy in the Congress library. It appears to me that the good Father was an honest, well meaning, but most ignorant friar, of one of the mendicant orders. His residence among the Hurons was very short, not more than a twelve-month; he was, I know not for what reason, called home by his superiors, and left America with great regret. He has collected a number of words and phrases of the Huron language in the form of a vocabulary, which he improperly calls a dictionary. I have had it copied and shall shew it to you when you come to town. You will be satisfied when you see it, that the good man not only never analysed the language of the Hurons, but was incapable of doing it. He was perfectly bewildered in the variety of its forms, and drew the very common conclusion that what he could not comprehend was necessarily barbarous and irregular. From an attentive perusal of his "dictionary," I am inclined to draw the opposite conclusion from that which he has drawn. There appears to me to be in it sufficient internal evidence to shew that the Huron language is rich in grammatical forms, and that it is constructed much on the same plan with the Delaware. I shall be very glad to have your opinion on it, with such information as you are able and willing to give. I beg particularly that you will let me know whether there are roots and derivations in the Indian languages, analogous to those of our own?

I am, &c.

LETTER XIII.

TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 18th July, 1816.

DEAR SIR—In your letter of the 27th of May you have said that you believed the Delaware nation were those whom the Baron La Hontan meant to designate by the name of *Algonkins*. In a subsequent letter, (June 20th), you seem to consider them as distinct nations, but nearly allied to each other; you say you are not well acquainted with their language, which is not the same with that of the Lenape, though there is a considerable affinity between them. Upon the whole I suppose that you have meant to apply the denomination Algonkins, not only to the Delawares proper, but to all the nations and tribes of the same family.

This has led me to consider who those Algonkins might be that La Hontan speaks of, and upon the best investigation that I have been able to make of the subject, I am inclined to believe that La Hontan's Algonkins are properly those whom we call *Chippeways*, a family or branch of the Delawares, but not the Delawares themselves. I first turned to Dr. Barton's "New Views of the Origin of the Nations and Tribes of America," in which I found that he considered the Delawares and Chippeways as two distinct people; but when I came to the specimens which he gives of their languages in his Vocabularies, I found no difference whatever in the idioms of the two nations. Pursuing the enquiry further, I compared the Vocabulary of the Chippeway language given by Carver in his travels, and that of the Algonkin by La Hontan, and was much astonished to find the words in each language exactly alike, without any difference but what arises from the French and English orthography. The

words explained by the two authors, happen also to be precisely the same, and are arranged in the same alphabetical order. So that either Carver is a gross plagiarist, who has pretended to give a list of Chippeway words and has only copied the Algonkin words given by La Hontan, or the Chippeways and Algonkins are one and the same people. I shall be very glad to have your opinion on this subject.

I find in Zeisberger's Grammar something that I cannot well comprehend. It is the verb "*n'dellauchsi*" which he translates "I live, move about," or "I so live that I "move about." Pray, is this the only verb in the Delaware language, which signifies "*to live*," and have the Indians no idea of "life," but when connected with "*locomotion?*"

Is the *W* in the Delaware, as your Missionaries write it, to be pronounced like the same letter in German, or like the English *W* and the French *ou*? If this letter has the German sound, then it is exactly the same as that of our *V;* in that case I am astonished that the Delawares cannot pronounce the *F*, the two sounds being so nearly alike. I am, &c.

LETTER XIV.

FROM MR. HECKEWELDER.

Bethlehem, 22d July, 1816.

Dear Sir—I received at the same time your two letters of the 13th and 18th inst. the last by our friend Dr. Wistar. I think you are wrong to complain of the little importance attached by the learned of Europe to the study of Indian languages and of the false ideas which some of them have conceived respecting them. The truth is that sufficient pains have not been taken in this country

to make them known. Our Missionaries have, indeed, compiled grammars and dictionaries of those idioms, but more with a view to practical use and to aid their fellow labourers in the great work of the conversion of the Indians to Christianity, than in order to promote the study of the philosophy of language. They have neither sought fame nor profit, and therefore their compositions have remained unknown except in the very limited circle of our religious society. It belongs to the literary associations of America to pursue or encourage those studies in a more extended point of view, and I shall be happy to aid to the utmost of my power the learned researches of the American Philosophical Society.

Your remarks on Lord Monboddo's opinion respecting the Indian languages, and on Father Sagard's work, on which that opinion is founded, I believe to be correct. I am not acquainted with the language of the Hurons, which I have always understood to be a dialect of that of the Iroquois, or at least to be derived from the same stock, and I cannot conceive why it should be so poor and so imperfect as the good Father describes it, while its kindred idiom, the Iroquois, is directly the reverse. At least, it was so considered by Mr. Zeisberger, who was very well acquainted with it. Sir William Johnson thought the same, and I believe you will find his opinion on the subject in one of the Volumes of the Transactions of the Royal Society of London.* Colden, in his History of the Five Nations, says "that the verbs of that "language are varied, but in a manner so different from "the Greek and Latin, that his informant could not dis-"cover by what rule it was done."† I suspect his informant had not yet acquired a very profound knowledge of the Iroquois; but from his imperfect description of their verbs, I am very nearly convinced that they are

* See Philos. Trans. abridged; vol. lxiii. 142.

† Colden's Hist. of the Five Nations. Octavo ed. 1747, p. 14.

formed on the same model with those of the Lenni Lenape, which Mr. Zeisberger has well described in his Grammar of that language. Colden praises this idiom in other respects; he says that the Six Nations compound their words without end, whereby their language becomes sufficiently copious." This is true also of the Delawares.

The Hurons are the same people whom we call Wyandots; the Delawares call them *Delamattenos*. I am inclined to believe that the tribe whom we call *Naudowessies*, and the French, *Sioux*, who are said to live to the west or north-west of Lake Superior, are a branch of the Hurons; for the rivers which we call *Huron*, (of which there are three),* are called by the Chippeways, *Naduwewi*, or *Naudowessie Sipi*. But of this I cannot be sure; though I would rather conclude that *Naudowessie* is the Chippeway name for all the Wyandots or Hurons. It is a fact which, I think, deserves to be ascertained. It is a very common error to make several Indian nations out of one, by means of the different names by which it is known.

I proceed to answer the questions contained in your letter of the 18th.

As it seems to me probable that the Naudowessies and Hurons, though called by different names, are the same people; so it may be the case with the Chippeways and the Algonkins, although I have no greater certainty of this hypothesis than of the former. I have no doubt, however, of their being both derived from the same stock, which is that of the Lenni Lenape: that their languages are strikingly similar is evident from the two vocabularies that you mention, and I had rather believe that they both speak the same language, than that Captain Carver was a plagiarist. The accounts which he gives

* One of them empties itself into the north side of Lake St. Clair, another at the west end of Lake Erie, and a third on the south side of the said lake, about twenty-five miles east of Sandusky river or bay.

of the Indians I have found in general correct; which is the more remarkable, that from his own account, it appears that he did not reside very long among them. He must have been, therefore, a very attentive and accurate observer.

It is very probable that I did not express myself with sufficient precision in the passages of my letters of the 27th of May and 20th of June to which you refer. The Lenni Lenape, or Delawares, are the head of a great family of Indian nations who are known among themselves by the generic name of *Wapanachki*, or "Men of the East." The same language is spread among them all in various dialects, of which I conceive the purest is that of the chief nation, the Lenape, at whose residence the grand national councils meet, and whom the others, by way of respect, style *grandfather*. The Algonkins are a branch of that family, but are not, in my opinion, entitled to the pre-eminence which the Baron La Hontan ascribes to them. He applied the name "Algonkin," in a more extensive sense than it deserves, and said that the Algonkin language was the finest and most universally spread of any on the continent; a praise to which I think the Lenni Lenape idiom alone is entitled. In this sense only I meant to say that the Baron included the Delawares in the general descriptive name of "Algonkins."

I have yet to answer your questions respecting the language, which I shall do in a subsequent letter.

I am, &c.

LETTER XV.

FROM THE SAME.

Bethlehem, 24th July, 1816.

DEAR SIR—I have now to answer your question on the subject of the Delaware verb, *n'dellauchsi,* which Zeisberger translates by "I live, or move about, or "I so live that I move about." You ask whether this is the only verb inthe language which expresses "*to live,*" and whether theIndians have an idea of *life,* otherwise than as connected with *locomotion?*

Surely they have; and I do not see that the contrary follows from Mr. Zeisberger's having chosen this particular verb as an example of the first conjugation. I perceive you have not yet an adequate idea of the copiousness of the Indian languages, which possess an immense number of comprehensive words, expressive of almost every possible combination of ideas. Thus the proper word for "*to live*" is in the pure Unami dialect *lehaleheen.* An Unami meeting an aged acquaintance, whom he has not seen for a length of time, will address him thus: "*Ili k'lehelleya?*" which means, "are you yet "alive?" The other will answer "*Ili n'papomissi,*"* "I "am yet able to walk about." The verb *n'dellauchsin,* which Mr. Zeisberger quotes, is more generally employin a spiritual sense, "*n'dellauchsin Patamawos wulelen-*"*dam,*" "I live up, act up to the glory of God." This verb, like *pommauchsin,* implies action or motion, connected with *life,* which is still the principal idea. I do not know of any thing analogous in the English language, except, perhaps, when we say "To *walk* humbly before "God;" but here the word *walk* contains properly no idea in itself but that of locomotion, and is not coupled with the idea of *life,* as in the Indian verb which I have

* From the verb *Pommauchsin.*

cited. The idea intended to be conveyed arises in English entirely from the *figurative* sense of the word, in the Delaware from the *proper* sense.

I should never have done, were I to endeavour to explain to you in all their details the various modes which the Indians have of expressing ideas, shades of ideas, and combinations of ideas; for which purpose the various parts of speech are successively called to their aid. In the conjugations of the verbs, in Zeisberger's Grammar, you will find but three tenses, present, past and future; but you will be much mistaken if you believe that there are no other modes of expressing actions and passions in the verbal form as connected with the idea of time. It would have been an endless work to have given all those explanations in an elementary grammar intended for the use of young Missionaries, who stood in need only of the principal forms, which they were to perfect afterwards by practice. Let me now try to give you a faint idea of what I mean by a few examples in the Delaware language.

N'mitzi, *I eat.**
N'mamitzi, *I am eating, or am in the act of eating.*
N'mitzihump, *I have eaten.*
Metschi n'gischi mitzi, *I am come from eating.*
N'dappi mitzi, *I am returned from eating.*

The first two *n'mitzi* and *n'mamitzi*, both mean *I eat*, but the one is used in the indefinite and the other in the definite sense, and a good speaker will never employ the one instead of the other. The three last expressions are all past tenses of the verb "*I eat*," and all mean, "*I have eaten*," but a person just risen from table, will not say, "*n'dappi mitzi*;" this expression can only be used after leaving the place where he has been eating, in answer to a person who asks him "where he comes

* In the original it is *N'mizi*; the German *z* being pronounced like *tz*, which mode of spelling has been adopted in this publication.

from." The word "*n'dappi*" is connected with the verb *apatschin*, to return. There is another distinction, proper to be mentioned here. If the place where the person comes from is near, he says "*n'dappi*," if distant "*n'dappa*." Thus:

N'dappi pihm, *I am come from sweating (or from the sweat oven.)*

N'dappihackiheen, *I am come from planting.*

N'dappi wickheen, *I am come from building a house.*

N'dappimanschasqueen, *I am come from mowing grass.*

N'dappi notamæsin, *I am come from striking fish with a spear.*

N'dappallauwin, *I am come (returned) from hunting.*

N'dappachtopalin, *I am come (returned) from making war.*

In the future tense I could shew similar distinctions, but it would lead me too far.

I must now take notice of what Father Sagard says, as you have mentioned in your letter of the 13th inst. that the Indian languages have "no *roots*, and that "there is no regularity in the formation of their words." It is certain that the manner in which the Indians in general form their words is different from that of the Europeans, but I can easily prove to you that they understand the manner of forming them from "*roots*." I take, for instance the word *wulit*, good, proper, right, from which are derived:

Wulik, *the good.*
Wulaha, *better.*
Wulisso, *fine, pretty.*
Wulamoewagan, *truth.*
Wulatenamuwi, *happy.*
Wulatenamoagan, *happiness.*
Wulapensowagan, *blessing.*
Wulapan, *fine morning.*
Wuliechen, *it is good, or well done.*
Wulittol, *they are good.*

Wuliken, *it grows well, thrives.*
Wuliechsin, *to speak well.*
Wulelendam, *to rejoice.*
Wulamallsin, *to be well, happy.*
Wulandeu, Wuligischgu, } *a fine day.*
Wulapeyu, *just, upright.*
Wuliwatam, *to be of good understanding.*
Wuliachpin, *to be in a good place.*
Wulilissin, *to do well.*
Wulilissu, *he is good.*
Wulilissick, *behave ye well.*
Wulinaxin, *to look well.*
Wulamoeyu, *it is true.*
Wulantowagan, *grace.*
Wulatopnachgat, *a good word.*
Wulatopnamik, *good tidings.*
Wulatonamin, *to be happy.*
Wulissowagan, *prettiness, handsome appearance.*
Wulihilleu, *it is good.*
Wulineichquot, *it is well to be seen.*
Wulelemileu, *it is wonderful.*
Wulitehasu, *well cut or hewed.*
Wuliwiechinen, *to rest well.*
Welsit Mannitto, *the Good Spirit.*
From Machtit, *bad.*
Machtitsu, *nasty.*
Machtesinsu, *ugly.*
Machtschi *or* Matschi Mannitto *or* Machtando, *the evil Spirit, the Devil,* &c.

You will naturally observe that the words derived from the root *Wulit,* imply in general the idea of what is good, handsome, proper, decent, just, well, and so pursuing the same general object to *happiness* and its derivatives; *happiness* being considered as a good and pleasant feeling, or situation of the mind, and a person who is *happy,* as

being *well*. This does not, as you might suppose, make the language ambiguous; for the Indians speak and understand each other with great precision and clearness.

I have yet to answer your question about the *f* and *w*. There are in the Delaware language no such consonants as the German *w*, or English *v*, *f*, or *r*. Where *w* in this language is placed before a vowel, it sounds the same as in English; before a consonant, it represents a *whistled* sound of which I cannot well give you an idea on paper, but which I shall easily make you understand by uttering it before you when we meet. I am, &c.

LETTER XVI.

TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 31st July, 1816.

Dear Sir--I have received with the greatest pleasure your two favours of the 24th and 26th inst.; the last, particularly, has opened to me a very wide field for reflection. I am pursuing with ardour the study of the Indian languages (I mean of their grammatical forms) in all the authors that I can find that have treated of the subject, and am astonished at the great similarity which I find between those different idioms from Greenland even to Chili. They all appear to me to be compounded on a model peculiar to themselves, and of which I had not before an idea. Those personal forms of the verbs, for instance, which you mention in your letter of the 20th of June, I find generally existing in the American languages. The Spanish-Mexican Grammarians call them *transitions*, but they are not all equally happy in their modes of explaining their nature and use. The word "*transition*," however, I think extremely well chosen, as it gives at

once an idea of the passage of the verb from the pronoun that governs to that which is governed, from "I love" to "I love you." The forms of the Indian verbs are so numerous, that a proper technical term is very much wanted to distinguish this particular class, and I adopt with pleasure this appropriate Spanish name, at least, until a better one can be found.

I am sufficiently satisfied from the examples in your last letter that the Indians have in their languages "roots," or radical words from which many others are derived; indeed, I never doubted it before, and only meant to shew you by the instances of Father Sagard, and Lord Monboddo, what false ideas the Europeans have conceived on this subject. The various meanings of the word "*wulit*" and its derivatives, obtained, as you have shewn, by easy or natural transitions from one kindred idea to another, are nothing new in language. The Greek has the word "*kalos*," which in its various meanings is very analogous to "*wulit*." Instances of similar "transitions" from different European idioms might be cited without end. There is one in the French, which strikes me at this moment with peculiar force. In that language, an honest man is "*just*" in his dealings and a judge in his judgments; but a pair of shoes is so likewise, when made exactly to fit the foot, and by a natural transition, when the shoes are too tight, they are said to be too *just* (trop justes.) A foreigner in France is reported to have said to his shoemaker, complaining of the tightness of a pair of new made shoes: "*Monsieur, ces souliers sont trop équitables.*" I remember also an English song, beginning with the words "*Just like love*," where you see the word "*just*" is employed without at all implying the idea of *equity* or *justice*. But justice is strict, exact, correct, precise, and therefore the word *just* is employed for the purpose of expressing these and other ideas connected with that to which it was first applied.

I have made these trite observations, because I am

well aware that many *a priori* reasoners would not fail to find in so many words of different meanings derived from the same root, a proof of the poverty of the Indian languages. They would say that they are poor, because they have but few radical words, a conclusion which they would infallibly make without taking the pains of ascertaining the fact. If they were told that the Greek (the copiousness of which is universally acknowledged) has itself but a comparatively small number of roots, they would not be at a loss to find some other reason in support of their pre-conceived opinion. I have read somewhere (I cannot recollect in what book,) that there was not a greater proof of the barbarism of the Indian languages, than the comprehensiveness of their locutions. The author reasoned thus: Analysis, he said, is the most difficult operation of the human mind; it is the last which man learns to perform. Savage nations, therefore, express many ideas in a single word, because they have not yet acquired the necessary skill to separate them from each other by the process of analysis, and to express them simply.

If this position were true, it would follow that all the languages of savage nations have been in the origin formed on the same model with those of the American Indians, and that simple forms have been gradually introduced into them by the progress of civilisation. But if we take the trouble of enquiring into facts, they will by no means lead us to this conclusion. It is not many centuries since the Scandinavian languages of the North of Europe were spoken by barbarous and savage nations, but we do not find that in ancient times they were more comprehensive in their grammatical forms than they are at present, when certainly they are the least so, perhaps, of any of the European idioms; on the other hand, the Latin and Greek were sufficiently so by means of the various moods and tenses of their verbs, all expressed in one single word, without the use of auxiliaries; and yet

these two nations had attained a very high degree, at least, of civilisation. I do not, therefore, see as yet, that there is a necessary connexion between the greater or lesser degree of civilisation of a people, and the organisation of their language. These general conclusions from insulated facts ought constantly to be guarded against; they are the most fruitful sources of error in the moral as well as in the natural sciences. Facts ought to be collected and observations multiplied long before we venture to indulge in theoretical inferences; for unobserved facts seem to lie in ambush, to start up at once in the face of fine spun theories, and put philosophers in the wrong.

I wish very much that some able linguist would undertake to make a good classification of the different languages of the world (as far as they are known) in respect to their grammatical forms. It was once attempted in the French Encyclopedia, but without success, because the author had only in view the Latin and Greek, and those of the modern languages which he was acquainted with. His division, if I remember right, was formed between those idioms in which inversions are allowed, and those in which they are not. Of course, it was the Latin and Greek on the one side, and the French, Italian, &c. on the other. This meagre classification has not been generally adopted, nor does it, in my opinion, deserve to be. A greater range of observation ought to be taken.

I do not pretend to possess talents adequate to carrying into execution the plan which I here suggest; but I beg you will permit me to draw a brief sketch of what I have in view.

I observe, in the first place, in the eastern parts of Asia, a class of languages formed on the same model, of which I take that which is *spoken* in the empire of China, as it stood before its conquest by the Tartars, to be the type. In this language, there is but a very small num-

ber of words, all monosyllables. As far as I am able to judge from the excellent grammars of this idiom of which we are in possession, the words convey to the mind only the principal or leading ideas of the discourse, unconnected with many of those accessary ideas that are so necessary to give precision to language, and the hearer is left to apply and arrange the whole together as well as he can. It has but few or no grammatical forms, and is very deficient in what we call the connecting parts of speech. Hence it is said that the words spoken are not immediately understood by those to whom they are addressed, and that auxiliary modes of explanation, others than oral communication, are sometimes resorted to, when ambiguities occur. As I am no Sinologist, I will not undertake to say that the description which I have attempted to give of this language, from the mere reading of grammars and dictionaries, is very accurate, but I venture to assert that it differs so much from all others that we know, that with its kindred idioms, it deserves to form a *genus* in a general classification of the various modes of speech. From its great deficiency of grammatical forms, I would give to this genus the name *asyntactic.*

My second class of languages would consist of those which possess, indeed, grammatical forms, sufficient to express and connect together every idea to be communicated by means of speech, but in which those forms are so organised, that almost every distinct idea has a single word to convey or express it. Such are the Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, and even the German and English. Those forms of the nouns and verbs which are generally called declensions and conjugations, are in these languages the result of an analytical process of the mind, which has given to every single idea and sometimes to a shade of an idea, a single word to express it. Thus when we say "*of the man,*" here are three ideas, which in the Latin are expressed by one single word "*hominis.*" In the locution "*I will not,*" or "*I am not willing,*" and

in the verbal form "*I will go,*" three or four ideas are separately expressed in English, which, in Latin are conveyed together by single words "*nolo,*" "*ibo.*" From this peculiar quality of sufficiently yet separately expressing all the necessary ideas, I would denominate this class of languages *analytical,* or *analytic.*

The third class would, of course, be that in which the principal parts of speech are formed by a synthetical operation of the mind, and in which several ideas are frequently expressed by one word. Such are what are called the Oriental languages, with the Latin, Greek, Slavonic, and others of the same description. These I would call *synthetic.*

The French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, with their various dialects, in which conquest has in a great degree intermingled the modes of speech of the second and third class, would together form a fourth, which I would call "*mixed.*"

In these various classes I have not found a place for the Indian languages, which richly deserve to form one by themselves. They are "*synthetic*" in their forms, but to such a degree as is not equalled by any of the idioms which I have so denominated, and which are only such in comparison with others where *analytic* forms prevail. That they deserve to make a class by themselves cannot be doubted. They are the very opposite of the Chinese, of all languages the poorest in words, as well as in grammatical forms, while these are the richest in both. In fact, a great variety of forms, necessarily implies a great multiplicity of words; I mean, complex forms, like those of the Indians; compound words in which many ideas are included together, and are made to strike the mind in various ways by the simple addition or subtraction of a letter or syllable. In the Chinese much is understood or guessed at, little is expressed; in the Indian, on the contrary, the mind is awakened to each idea meant to be conveyed, by some

one or other of the component parts of the word spoken. These two languages, therefore, as far as relates to their organisation, stand in direct opposition to each other; they are the top and bottom of the idiomatic scale, and as I have given to the Chinese and its kindred dialects, the name of *asyntactic*, the opposite name, *syntactic*, appears to me that which is best suited to the languages of the American Indians. I find that instead of asking you questions, as I ought to do, I am wandering again in the field of metaphysical disquisitions. I shall try to be more careful in my next letter. I am, &c.

LETTER XVII.

TO THE SAME.

Philadelphia, 3d August, 1816.

Dear Sir—I now return to my proper station of a scholar asking questions of his master. In your letter of the 24th ult. you have fully satisfied me that the Indians have a great number of word derived from "*roots*," much in the same manner as in the languages of Europe, but you have said at the same time "that the manner in "which the Indians in general form their words, is dif-"ferent from that of the Europeans." I am very anxious to have this manner explained, and I shall be very much obliged to you for all the information that you can give me on the subject.

I have told you already that I thought I had reason to believe that all the American languages were formed on the same general plan. If I am correct in my supposition, I think I have found in the language of Greenland, the identical manner of compounding words which I am now calling upon you to explain. You will tell me whe-

ther I have judged right, and you will at once destroy or confirm my favourite hypothesis. According to the venerable Egede, words are formed in the Greenland language by taking and joining together a part of each of the radical words, the ideas of which are to be combined together in one compound locution. One or more syllables of each simple word are generally chosen for that purpose and combined together, often leaving out the harsh consonants for the sake of euphony. Thus from "*agglekpok*," he writes, "*pekipok*," he mends or does better, and "*pinniarpok*," he endeavours, is formed the compound word "*agglekiniaret*," which means, "endea-"vour to write better." The first syllable "*agl*," is taken from "agl*ekpok*," the second "*ek*" from the same word and also from the first syllable of "pek*ipok*," leaving out the *p* to avoid harshness, and the third "*inniar*" from "Pinniar*pok*," also leaving out the initial consonant for the same reason. It seems to me that I find something like it in the Delaware language. According to Zeisberger, *wet*oochw*ink* signifies "father." Now taking the second syllable *ooch*, and placing *n* before it, you have "*nooch*," my father. To be sure, it is not the first syllable that is borrowed, as in the above example from the Greenlandish, but the principle appears, nevertheless, to be the same in both languages.

On the subject of this word "*father*" I observe a strange contradiction between two eminent writers on Indian languages, evidently derived from the stock of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware. One of them, Roger Williams, in his Key to the Language of the New England Indians, says "*osh*" (meaning probably *och* or *ooch*, as the English cannot pronounce the guttural *ch*) father; "*nosh*," my father; "*kosh*," thy father, &c. On the other hand, the Rev. Jonathan Edwards, in his observations on the language of the *Muhhekanew* (Mohican) Indians, speaks as follows: "A considerable part of the "appellations are never used without a pronoun affixed.

The Mohegans say, my father, "*nogh*," (again *noch* or *nooch*) thy father "*kogh*," &c. but they cannot say absolutely "*father*." There is no such word in their language. If you were to say "*ogh*," you would make a Mohegan both stare and smile." (page 18.)

Roger Williams

Which of these two professors is right? It seems that either Rogers invented the word *osh* for "father," from analogy, or that Edwards is not correct when he says that *ogh* or *ooch* singly, mean nothing in the Indian language. Is he not mistaken when he says that there is no word whatever answering to "father," or "the father," in an abstract sense; and if an Indian would stare and smile when a white man says *ooch*, would he smile in the same manner if he said *wetoochwink?* Is it possible to suppose that this respectable author had only a partial knowledge of the language on which he wrote, and that he was not acquainted with the radical word from which *nooch* and *kooch* had been formed? Or is there no such radical word, and has Zeisberger himself committed a mistake?

I beg leave to submit to you also another observation that I have made. It appears from the work of the late Dr. Barton, who quotes your authority for it, that the name of the *Lenni Lenape*, means "*the original people*," and that "*Lenno*" in the Delaware language signifies "man," in the general sense, (*Mensch.*) Now, it appears that in the language of the *Micmacs* (a tribe of Nova Scotia,) they call an Indian "*Illenoh*," and in that of the Canadian mountaineers (whom some believe to be the Algonkins proper) they say "*Illenon*." (Mass. Histor. Coll. for the year 1799, pp. 18, 19.) I am apt to believe that those names are the same with "*Lenno*," and that it is from them that the French have formed the name "*Illinois*," which extends even beyond the Mississippi. In the speech of the Indian chief *Garangula*, to the Governor of Canada, related by La Hontan, the warrior says: "You must know, Onontio, that we have robbed

"no Frenchmen, but those who supplied the "*Illinois*," "and the "*Oumamis*," our enemies, with powder and "ball." I am inclined to believe that Garangula when he spoke of the *Illinois* meant the *Lenni Lenape*, and by the name of *Oumamis*, intended to describe their chief tribe, the *Unamis*. Of this, however, I leave you to judge. But I strongly suspect that "*Lenno*," "*Lenni*," "*Illenoh*," "*Illenou*," "*Illinois*," are the same name, and all apply to that great nation whom the Baron La Hontan takes to be the *Algonkins*, who, it would seem are only called so by way of discrimination, but consider themselves as a branch of the great family of the "*Illenou*." If I am correct in this, how do you make out that *Lenni Lenape* means "*original people?*"

The Greenlanders, according to Egede, call themselves *Innuit*, which in their language also signifies *men*. It appears to me to be very much akin to *Illenoh*, *Illenu*. Could the Greenlanders be in any way connected with the *Lenni Lenape?*

Pray tell me from what languages are derived the words *squaw*, *sachem*, *tomohawk*, *calumet*, *wampum*, *papoose*, which are so much in use among us? Are they of the Delaware or the Iroquois stock? I am, &c.

LETTER XVIII.

FROM MR. HECKEWELDER.

Bethlehem, 12th August, 1816.

Dear Sir—I have duly received your two letters of the 31st of July and 3d of August last. I am much pleased with your metaphysical disquisitions, as you call them, and I beg you will indulge in them with perfect freedom, whenever you shall feel so disposed. I agree with you that a proper classification of human languages

would be a very desirable object; but I fear the task is too hard ever to be accomplished with the limited knowledge of man. There are, no doubt, many varieties in language yet to be discovered.

As you wish to be acquainted with the manner in which our North American Indians compound their words, I shall endeavour to satisfy you as well as I am able. The process is much the same as that which Egede has described with respect to the Greenland language, and this strongly corroborates your opinion respecting the similarity of forms of at least of those of North America. In the Delaware and other languages that I am acquainted with, parts or parcels of different words, sometimes a single sound or letter, are compounded together, in an artificial manner, so as to avoid the meeting of harsh or disagreeable sounds, and make the whole word fall in a pleasant manner upon the ear. You will easily conceive that words may thus be compounded and multiplied without end, and hence the peculiar richness of the American languages. Of this I can give you numerous examples. In the first place, the word "*nadholineen.*" It is a simple short word, but means a great deal. The ideas that are conveyed by it are these; "Come with the canoe "and take us across the river or stream." Its component parts are as follows: The first syllable "*nad*" is derived from the verb "*naten,*" to fetch; the second, "*hol,*" from "*amochol*" a canoe or boat; "*ineen*" is the verbal termination for "*us,*" as in *milineen,* "give us;"—the simple ideas, therefore, contained in this word, are "*fetch canoe us,*" but in its usual and common acceptation it means, "come and fetch us across the river with a ca-"noe." I need not say that this verb is conjugated through all its moods and tenses. *Nadholawall* is the form of the third person of the singular of the indicative present, and means "He is fetched over the river with a canoe," or simply, "He is fetched over the river."

From *wunipach,* a leaf, *nach,* a hand, and *quim,* a nut

growing on a tree (for there is a peculiar word to express nuts of this description and distinguish them from other nuts) is formed *wunachquim*, an acorn, and the ideas which by this name are intended to be conveyed are these: "The nut of the tree the leaves of which "resemble a hand, or have upon them the form of a hand." If you will take the trouble to examine the leaves of an oak tree, you will find on them the form of a hand with outspread fingers. On the same principle are formed

M'sim, *hickory nut.*

Ptucquim, *walnut.*

Wapim, *chesnut.*

Schauwemin, *beech nut*, and many others.

The tree which we call "*Spanish oak*," remarkable for the largeness of its leaves, they call "*Amanganasch-*"*quiminschi*," "the tree which has the largest leaves "shaped like a hand." If I were to imitate the composition of this word in English and apply it to our language, I would say *Largehandleafnuttree*, and softening the sounds after the Indian manner, it would perhaps make *Larjandliffentree*, or *Larjandlennuttree*, or something like it. Of course, in framing the word, an English ear should be consulted. The last syllable of that which I have last cited, is not taken from the proper name for *tree*, which is *hittuck*; but from "*achpansi*," which means the "stock, trunk or body of a tree" (in German, "*der stamm*"). The last syllable of this word, "*si*," is in its compound converted into *schi*, probably for the sake of euphony, of which an Indian ear in this case is the best judge.

Again, "*nanayunges*," in Delaware "means a horse." It is formed from *awesis*, a beast, from which the last syllable *es* is taken, and *nayundam*, to carry a burden on the back or shoulders; for when something is carried in the hands or arms, the proper verb is "*gelenummen*." The word which signifies "horse," therefore, literally means, "the beast which carries on its back," or in other

words "a beast of burden." Were asses or camels known to the Indians, distinctive appellations for them would soon and easily be formed.

Thus much for the names of *natural substances*, and words which relate to visible objects. Let us now turn to the expression of ideas which affect the moral sense.

You will remember that I have told you before that "*wulik*" or "*wulit*" signifies "good," and in the various derivations which flow from it means almost every thing that is good, just, proper, decent, pleasing or agreeable. When an Indian wishes to express that he is pleased with something that you have told him, he will say in his metaphorical language: "You have spoken *good* words." Now let us see how this compound idea is expressed. "*Kolamoe*" is one of the forms of the past tense of a verb which means "to speak the truth," and properly translated signifies "thou hast spoken the truth," or "thou "hast spoken good words." *K*, from *ki*, expresses the second person, "*ola*" is derived from *wulit* and conveys the idea of *good;* the rest of the word implies the action of speaking.

In the third person "*wulamoe*," means "he has spo-"ken the truth;" from which is formed the noun substantive *wulamoewagan*, "*the* truth:" *wagan*, or *woagan* (as our German Missionaries sometimes write it to express the sound of the English *w*) being a termination which answers to that of "*ness*" in English, and "*heit*" or "*keit*" in German. Pursuing further the same chain of ideas, *wulistamoewagan* or *wulamhittamoewagan*, means "faith" or "belief," the belief of what a man has seen or heard; for *glistam* is a verb which signifies "to "hear, hearken, listen;" hence "*wulista*," believe it, *wulistam*, he believes; *wulisto*, believe ye, &c. The Indians say *klistawi!* hear me! *nolsittammen*, I believe it; *ammen* or *tammen* abridged from *hittammen*, where they are employed as terminations, mean "to do, perform, adopt." See what a number of ideas are connected to-

gether in single words, and with what regularity they are compounded, with proper terminations indicating the part of speech, form, mood, tense, number and person, that they respectively belong to! The various shades of thought that those different modes of speech discriminate are almost innumerable; for instance, *wulistammen* means simply to believe; *wulamsittammen* to believe with full conviction. I would never have done, if I were to point out to you all the derivatives from this source, or connected with the idea of *belief*, which word I bring forward, merely by way of example, there being many others equally fruitful. There is *wulamoinaquot*, credible, worthy of belief (sometimes used as an impersonal verb, "it is credible, it deserves to be believed"); *welsittawot*, a believer; *welsittank*, a believer in the religious sense, &c.

The syllable *pal* or *pel* prefixed to some words, implies denial, and also frequently denotes wrong and is taken in a bad sense. Hence *palsittamoewagan*, unbelief; *palsittammen*, to disbelieve; *pelsittank*, an unbeliever; *pelsittangik*, unbelievers. Again, *palliwi*, otherwise; *palliton*, to spoil, to do something wrong; *palhiken*, to make a bad shot, to miss the mark in shooting; *palhitechen*, to aim a stroke and miss it; *pallahammen*, to miss in shooting at *game*; *pallilissin*, to do something amiss or wrong.

M. de Volney has very justly observed on the Miami language, which is a dialect of the Lenape, that *m* at the beginning of a word implies in general something bad or ugly. It is certainly so in the Delaware, though not without exceptions, for *mannitto*, a spirit, by which name God himself, the great and good Spirit, is called, begins with that ill-omened letter. Nevertheless the words "*machit*," bad, and "*medhick*," evil, have produced many derivatives, or words beginning with the syllables *med*, *mach*, *mat*, *mui*, *me*, *mas*, &c. all of which imply something bad, and are taken in a bad sense. For instance, *mekih* and *melih*, corruption; *machtando*, the devil; *mach-*

tageen, to fight, kill; *machtapan*, a bad, unpleasant morning; *machtapeek*, bad time, time of war; *machtonquam*, to have a bad dream, &c. I mention this merely to do justice to the sagacity of M. Volney, whose few observations upon the Indians induce us to regret that he was not in a situation to make more.

I begin to feel fatigued, and therefore shall take leave of you for the present and reserve the remainder of my answer for my next letter. I am, &c.

LETTER XIX.

FROM THE SAME.

Bethlehem, 15th August, 1816.

DEAR SIR—I sit down to conclude my answer to your letter of the 3d inst.

Before I begin this task, let me give you some examples that now occur to me to shew the regularity of the formation of Indian words.

1. The names of reptiles generally end in *gook* or *gookses*.

Achgook, *a snake*.

Suckachgook, *a black snake* (from *suck* or *suckeu*, black.)

Mamalachgook, *spotted snake*.

Asgaskachgook, *green snake*.

2. The names of fishes in *meek* (*Namæs*, a fish.)

Maschilameek, *a trout* (spotted fish.)

Wisameek, *cat-fish* (the fat fish.)

Suckameek, *black fish*.

Lennameek, *chub fish*.

3. The names of other animals, have in the same man-

ner regular terminations, *ap*, or *ape*, for walking in an erect posture; hence *lenape*, man; *chum*, for four-legged animals, and *wehelleu*, for the winged tribes. I need not swell this letter with examples, which would add nothing to your knowledge of the principle, which I have sufficiently explained.

I now proceed to answer your letter.

Notwithstanding Mr. Edwards's observation (for whom I feel the highest respect) I cannot help being of opinion, that the monosyllable *ooch*, is the proper word for *father*, abstractedly considered, and that it is as proper to say *ooch*, father, and *nooch*, my father, as *dallemons*, beast, and *n'dallemons*, my beast; or *nitschan*, child, or a child, and *n'nitschan*, my child. It is certain, however, that there are few occasions for using these words in their abstract sense, as there are so many ways of associating them with other ideas. *Wetoochwink* and *wetochemuxit* both mean "*the* father," in a more definite sense, and *wetochemelenk* is used in the vocative sense, and means "thou our father." I once heard captain Pipe, a celebrated Indian chief, address the British commandant at Detroit, and he said *nooch!* my father!

The shades of difference between these several expressions are so nice and delicate, that I feel great difficulty in endeavouring to explain them. *Wetochemuxit*, I conceive to be more properly applicable to the heavenly Father, than to an earthly one. It implies an idea of power and authority over his children, superior to that of mere procreation, therefore I think it fittest to be used in prayer and worship. *Wetoochwink*, on the contrary, by the syllable *we* or *wet*, prefixed to it, implies progeny and ownership over it;* and *wink* or *ink* conveys the idea of the actual existence of that progeny. Yet Zeisberger, who well under-

* *Wenitschanit*, the parent or owner of a child naturally begotten; *wetallemansit*, the owner of the beast.

stood the language, has used *wetoochwink* in the spiritual sense. Thus, in his Delaware Hymn Book, you find, page 15, *Pennamook Wetoochwink milquenk!* which is in English "Behold what the Father has given us!" Again, in the same book, page 32, we read, "*Hallewiwi wetochemuxit*," which means the "The Father of Eternity." Upon the whole I believe that *ooch* is a proper word for "father" or "a father," but *wetoochwink* may also be used in the same sense, notwithstanding its more definite general acceptation. There is little occasion, however, to use either with this abstract indefinite meaning.

I agree with you that *lenni, lenno, illenoh, illenou, illinois*, appear to have all the same derivation, and to be connected with the idea of *man, nation*, or *people*. *Lenno*, in the Delaware language, signifies man, and so does *Lenape*, in a more extended sense. In the name of the Lenni *Lenape*, it signifies *people;* but the word *lenni*, which precedes it, has a different signification and means *original*, and sometimes *common, plain, pure, unmixed*. Under this general description the Indians comprehend all that they believe to have been first created in the origin of things. To all such things they prefix the word *lenni;* as, for instance, when they speak of *high* lands, they say *lenni hacki* (original lands), but they do not apply the same epithet to *low* lands, which being generally formed by the overflowing or washing of rivers, cannot, therefore, be called *original*. Trees which grow on high lands are also called *lenni hittuck*, original trees. In the same manner they designate Indian corn, pumpkins, squashes, beans, tobacco, &c. all which they think were given by the Great Spirit for their use, *from the beginning*. Thus, they call Indian corn *lenchasqueem*, from *lenni* and *chasqueem;* beans, *lenalachksital*, from *lenni* and *malachksital;* tobacco, *lenkschatey*, from *lenni* and *kschatey;* which is thes ame as if they said *original corn, original beans, original tobacco*. They call the linden tree *lennikby*, from *lenni* and *wikby;* the last word by it-

self meaning "the tree whose bark peels freely," as the bark of that tree peels off easily all the year round. This bark is made use of as a rope for tying, and also for building their huts, the roof and sides of which are made of it. A house thus built is called *lennikgawon*, "original house or hut," from *lennikby*, original, or linden tree, *wikheen*, to build, and *jagawon* or *yagawon*, a house with a flat roof. It is as if they said "a house built of *original* materials."

Lennasqual, in the Minsi dialect, means a kind of grass which is supposed to have grown on the land from the beginning. English grasses, as timothy, &c. they call *schwannockasquall*, or white men's grass. The chub fish they call *lennameek*, because, say they, this fish is in all fresh water or streams, whereas other fish are confined to certain particular waters or climates.

They also say *lenni m'bi*, "pure water;" *leneyachkhican*, a fowling piece, as distinguished from a rifle, because it was the *first* fire-arm they ever saw; a rifle they call *ketupalachgat*. They say, *lenachsinnall*, "common stones," because stones are found every where, *lenachpoan*, "common bread" (*achpoan* means "bread"); *lenachgook*, a common snake, such as is seen every where (from *achgook* a snake); *lenchum*, the original, common dog, not of the species brought into the country by the white people. I think I have sufficiently explained the name "*Lenni Lenape*."

As I do not know the Greenland language, I cannot say how far the word "*innuit*" is connected with *lenni* or *lenno*, or any of the words or names derived from them.

The words *squaw*, *sachem*, *tomohawk*, and *wigwam*, are words of Delaware stock, somewhat corrupted by the English. *Ochqueu*, woman; *sakima*, chief; *tamahican*, hatchet;* *wickwam* (both syllables long, as in English

* All words ending in *ican*, *hican*, *kschican*, denote a sharp instrument for cutting. *Pachkschican*, a knife; *pkuschican*, a gimlet, an

weekwawm,) a house. Hence, *nik,* my house; *kik,* thy house; *wikit,* his house; *wikichtit,* their houses; *wikia,* at my house; *wiquahemink,* in the house; again, *wickheen,* to build a house; *wikhitschik,* the builders of a house; *wikheu,* he is building a house; *wikhetamok,* let us build a house; *wikheek,* (imperative) build a house; *wikhattoak,* they are building (a house or houses.)

Calumet is not an Indian word; M. Volney thinks it is an English word for a tobacco pipe; it is certainly not proper English, but I have always thought that it was first used by the English or the French. The Delaware for a tobacco pipe is *Poakan* (two syllables.)

Wampum is an Iroquois word, and means a marine shell.

Papoose I do not know; it is not a word of the Delaware language, yet it is possible that it may be used by some Indian nations, from whom we may have borrowed it. I have been told that the Mahicanni of New England made use of this word for a *child.* I am, &c.

LETTER XX.

TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 21st August, 1816.

DEAR SIR—I have read with the greatest pleasure your two interesting letters of the 12th and 15th. I need not tell you how pleased the Historical Committee are with your correspondence, which is laid before them from time to time. I am instructed to do all in my power to induce you to persevere in giving to your country the so much wanted information concerning the Indians and their languages. The Committee are convinced that the

instrument which cuts into holes; *tangamican,* or *tangandican,* a spear, a sharp pointed instrument; *poyachkican,* a gun, or an instrument that cuts with force.

first duty of an American Scientific Association is to occupy themselves with the objects that relate to our own country. It is on these subjects that the world has a right to expect instruction from us.

I am busily employed in studying and translating the excellent Delaware Grammar of Mr. Zeisberger; I hope the Historical Committee will publish it in due time. The more I become acquainted with this extraordinary language, the more I am delighted with its copiousness and with the beauty of its forms. Those which the Hispano-Mexican Grammarians call *transitions* are really admirable. If this language was cultivated and polished as those of Europe have been, and if the Delawares had a Homer or Virgil among them, it is impossible to say with such an instrument how far the art could be carried. The Greek is admired for its compounds; but what are they to those of the Indians? How many ideas they can combine and express together in one single locution, and that too by a regular series of grammatical forms, by innumerably varied inflexions of the same radical word, with the help of pronominal affixes! All this, my dear sir, is combined with the most exquisite skill, in a perfectly regular order and method, and with fewer exceptions or anomalies than I have found in any other language. This is what really astonishes me, and it is with the greatest difficulty that I can guard myself against enthusiastic feelings. The verb, among the Indians, is truly the *word* by way of excellence. It combines itself with the pronoun, with the adjective, with the adverb; in short with almost every part of speech. There are forms both positive and negative which include the two pronouns, the governing and the governed; *ktahoatell*, "I love thee;" *ktahoalowi*, "I do not love thee." The adverb "not," is comprised both actively and passively in the negative forms, *n'dahoalawi*, "I do not love;" *n'dahoalgussiwi*, "I am not loved;" and other adverbs are combined in a similar manner. From *schingi*, "unwil-

lingly," is formed *schingattam*, "to be unwilling," *schingoochwen*, "to go somewhere unwillingly," *schingimikemossin*, "to work unwillingly;" from *wingi*, "willingly," we have *wingsittam*, "to hear willingly," *wingachpin*, "to be willingly somewhere," *wingilauchsin*, "to "live willingly in a particular manner;" from the adverb *gunich*, "long," comes *gunelendam*, "to think one takes long to do something;" *gunagen*, "to stay out "long;" and so are formed all the rest of the numerous class of *adverbial verbs*. The *adjective verbs* are produced in the same way, by a combination of adjective nouns with the verbal form. Does *guneu* mean "long" in the adjective sense, you have *guneep*, it was long, *guneuchtschi*, it will be long, &c.; from *kschiechek*, "clean," is formed *kschiecheep*, "it was clean;" from *machkeu*, "red," *machkeep*, "it was red;" and so on through the whole class of words. Prepositions are combined in the same manner, but that is common also to other languages. What extent and variety displays itself in those Indian verbs, and what language, in this respect, can be compared to our savage idioms?

Nor are the participles less rich or less copious. Every verb has a long series of participles, which when necessary can be declined and used as adjectives. Let me be permitted to instance a few from the causative verb *wulamalessohen*, "to make happy." I take them from Zeisberger.

Wulamalessohaluwed, *he who makes happy.*
Wulamalessohalid, *he who makes me happy.*
Wulamalessohalquon, *he who makes thee happy.*
Wulamalessohalat, *he who makes him happy.*
Wulamalessohalquenk, *he who makes us happy.*
Wulamalessohalqueek, *he who makes you happy.*
Wulamalessohalquichtit, *he who makes them happy.*

Now comes another participial-pronominal-vocative form; which may in the same manner be conjugated

through all the *objective* persons. *Wulamalessohalian!* THOU WHO MAKEST ME HAPPY!

I will not proceed further; but permit me to ask you, my dear sir, what would Tibullus or Sappho have given to have had at their command a word at once so tender and so expressive? How delighted would be Moore, the poet of the loves and graces, if his language, instead of five or six tedious words slowly following in the rear of each other, had furnished him with an expression like this, in which the lover, the object beloved, and the delicious sentiment which their mutual passion inspires, are blended, are fused together in one comprehensive appellative term? And it is in the languages of savages that these beautiful forms are found! What a subject for reflection, and how little do we know, as yet, of the astonishing things that the world contains!

In the course of my reading, I have often seen the question discussed which of the two classes of languages, the *analytical* or the *synthetical* (as I call them) is the most perfect or is preferable to the other. Formerly there seemed to be but one sentiment on the subject, for who cannot perceive the superiority of the Latin and Greek, over the modern mixed dialects which at present prevail in Europe? But we live in the age of paradoxes, and there is no opinion, however extraordinary, that does not find supporters. To me it would appear that the perfection of language consists in being able to express much in a few words; to raise at once in the mind by a few magic sounds, whole masses of thoughts which strike by a kind of instantaneous intuition. Such in its effects must be the medium by which immortal spirits communicate with each other; such, I should think, were I disposed to indulge in fanciful theories, must have been the language first taught to mankind by the great author of all perfection.

All this would probably be admitted if the Latin and Greek were only in question: for their supremacy seems

to stand on an ancient legitimate title not easy to be shaken, and there is still a strong prepossession in the minds of the learned in favour of the languages in which Homer and Virgil sang. But since it has been discovered that the barbarous dialects of savage nations are formed on the same principle with the classical idioms, and that the application of this principle is even carried in them to a still greater extent, it has been found easier to ascribe the beautiful organisation of these languages to stupidity and barbarism, than to acknowledge our ignorance of the manner in which it has been produced. Philosophers have therefore set themselves to work in order to prove that those admirable combinations of ideas in the form of words, which in the ancient languages of Europe used to be considered as some of the greatest efforts of the human mind, proceed in the savage idioms from the absence or weakness of mental powers in those who originally framed them.

Among those philosophers the celebrated Dr. Adam Smith stands pre-eminent. In an elegant treatise on the origin and formation of language, he has endeavoured to shew that synthetical forms of speech were the first rude attempts which men made to communicate their ideas, and that they employed comprehensive and generic terms, because their minds had not yet acquired the powers of analysis and were not capable of discriminating between different objects. Hence, he says every river among primitive men was *the river*, every mountain *the mountain*, and it was very long before they learned to distinguish them by particular names. On the same principle, he continues, men said in one word *pluit* (it rains,) before they could so separate their confused ideas as to say *the rain* or *the water is falling*. Such is the sense and spirit of his positions, which I quote from memory.

This theory is certainly very ingenious; it is only unfortunate that it does not accord with facts, as far as our observations can trace them. You have shown that the

comprehensive compounds of the Delaware idiom are formed out of other words expressive of single ideas; these simple words, therefore, must have been invented before they were compounded into others, and thus analysis presided over the first formation of the language. So far, at least, Dr. Smith's theory falls to the ground; nor does he appear to be better supported in his supposition of the pre-existence of generic terms. For Dr. Wistar has told me, and quotes your authority for it, that such are seldom in use among the Indians, and that when a stranger pointing to an object asks how it is called, he will not be told a *tree*, a *river*, a *mountain*, but an ash, an oak, a beech; the Delaware, the Mississippi, the Allegheny. If this fact is correctly stated, it is clear that among those original people every tree is not *the tree*, and every mountain *the mountain*, but that, on the contrary, every thing is in preference distinguished by its specific name.

It is no argument, therefore, against the synthetical forms of language, that they are in use among savage nations. However barbarous may be the people by whom they are employed, I acknowledge that I can see nothing barbarous in them, but think, on the contrary, that they add much to the beauty of speech. This is neither the time nor the place to enter into an elaborate discussion of this subject, but I beg leave to be allowed to illustrate and support my opinion by a lively example taken from the Latin tongue.

Suetonius relates that the Roman Emperor Claudius (one of the most barbarous tyrants that ever existed,) once gave to his courtiers the spectacle of a naval combat on the Fucine lake, to be seriously performed by gladiators. When the poor fellows saw the Emperor approaching, they hailed him with "*Ave, Imperator,* MORITURI "*te salutant!*" In English this means, "Hail, Cæsar! THOSE WHO ARE GOING TO DIE salute thee!" The tyrant was so moved, or rather struck with this unexpected ad-

dress, that before he had time to reflect he returned the salutation *Avete vos!* "Fare ye well!" This gracious reply, from the mouth of an Emperor, amounted to a pardon, and the gladiators, in consequence, refused to fight. But the monster soon returned to his natural ferocity, and after hesitating for a while whether he would destroy them all by fire and sword, he rose from his seat, and ran staggering along the banks of the lake, in the most disgusting agitation, and at last, partly by exhortations and partly by threats, compelled them to fight.* Thus far Suetonius.

Now, my dear sir, I put the question to you; if the gladiators, instead of *morituri*, had said in English *those who are about or going to die;* would the emperor even have hesitated for a moment, and would he not at once have ordered those men to fight on? In the word *morituri*, he was struck at the first moment with the terrible idea of death placed in full front by means of the syllable MOR, while the future termination ITURI with the accessary ideas that it involves was calculated to produce a feeling of tender compassion on his already powerfully agitated mind, and in fact did produce it though it lasted only a short time. But if instead of this rapid succession of strong images, he had been assailed at first with five insignificant words *Those—who—are—going—to*, foreseeing what was about to follow, he would have had time to make up his mind before the sentence had been quite pronounced, and I doubt much whether the gladiators would have been allowed time to finish it. In German, *Diejenigen welche am sterben sind*, would have pro-

* Quin et emissurus Fucinum lacum, naumachiam ante commisit. Sed cum proclamantibus naumachiariis "Ave, Imperator! morituri te salutant," respondisset "Avete vos!" neque post hanc vocem, quasi veniâ datâ, quisquam dimicare vellet, diù cunctatus an omnes igni ferroque absumeret, tandem è sede sua prosiluit, ac per ambitum lacûs, non sine fœdâ vacillatione discurrens, partim minando, partim adhortando, ad pugnam compulit. Sueton. in Claud. 21.

duced much the same effect, from the length of the words *diejenigen* and *welche*, which have no definite meaning, and could in no manner have affected the feelings of the tyrant Claudius. *Ceux qui vont mourir*, in French, is somewhat shorter, but in none of the modern languages do I find any thing that operates on my mind like the terrible and pathetic *morituri*. May we not exclaim here with the great Goethe: *O, eine nation ist zu beneiden, die so feine Schattirungen in einem Worte auszudruecken weiss!* "O, how a nation is to be envied, that can ex- "press such delicate shades of thought in one single "word!"*

I hope, indeed I do not doubt, that there is a similar word in the Delaware language; if so, please to give it to me with a full explanation of its construction and meaning.

I thank you very much for the valuable information you have given on the subject of the word "*father*;" the distinction between *wetochemuxit*, and *wetoochwink*, appears to me beautiful, and Zeisberger seems to have perfectly understood it. When he makes use of the first of these words, he displays the "*Father of Eternity*" in all his glory; but when he says "*Behold what the father has* "*given us!*" he employs the word *wetoochwink*, which conveys the idea of a *natural father*, the better to express the paternal tenderness of God for his children. These elegant shades of expression shew in a very forcible manner the beauty and copiousness of the Indian languages, and the extent and the force of that natural logic, of those powers of feeling and discrimination, and of that innate sense of order, regularity and method which is possessed even by savage nations, and has produced such an admirable variety of modes of conveying human thoughts by means of the different organs and senses with which the Almighty has provided us.

Will you be so good as to inform me whether the Dela-

* Goethe, in Wilhelm Meister.

ware language admits of inversions similar or analogous to those of the Latin tongue; and in what order words are in general placed before or after each other? Do you say "*bread give me,*" or "*give me bread?*"

I am, &c.

LETTER XXI.

FROM MR. HECKEWELDER.

Bethlehem, 26th August, 1816.

Dear Sir—Your letter of the 21st inst. has done me the greatest pleasure. I see that you enter the spirit of our Indian languages, and that your mind is struck with the beauty of their grammatical forms. I am not surprised to find that you admire so much *wulamalessohalian,* it is really a fine expressive word; but you must not think that it stands alone; there are many others equally beautiful and equally expressive, and which are at the same time so formed as to please the ear. Such is *eluwiwulik,* a name which the Indians apply to Almighty God, and signifies "the most blessed, the most holy, the "most excellent, the most precious." It is compounded of *allowiwi,* which signifies "*more*" and *wulik,* the meaning of which has been fully explained in former letters. It is, as it were *allowiwi wulik;* the vowel *a,* in the first word being changed into *e.* By thus compounding this word *allowiwi* with others the Delawares have formed a great number of denominations, by which they address or designate the Supreme Being, such are:

Eliwulek, Allowilen, } *He who is above every thing.*

Eluwantowit, *God above all;* ("getannitowit" means *God.*)

Eluwiahoalgussit, *the beloved above all things.*
Elewassit, *the most powerful, the most majestic.*
Eluwitschanessik, *the strongest of all.*
Eluwikschiechsit, *the supremely good.*
Eluwilissit, *the one above all others in goodness.*

I have no doubt you will admire these expressions; our Missionaries found them of great use, and considered them as adding much to the solemnity of divine service, and calculated to promote and keep alive a deep sense of devotion to the Supreme Being. I entirely agree with you in your opinion of the superior beauty of compound terms; the Indians understand very well how to make use of them, and a great part of the force and energy of their speeches is derived from that source: it is very difficult, I may even say impossible, to convey either in German or English, the whole impressiveness of their discourses; I have often attempted it without success.

The word "*morituri*" which you cite from the Latin, affords a very good argument in support of the position which you have taken. It is really very affecting, and I am not astonished at the effect which it produced upon the mind of the cruel emperor. We have a similar word in the Delaware language, "*Elumiangellatschik,*" "those "who are on the point of dying, or who are about to "die." The first part of it *elumi,* is derived from the verb *n'dallemi,* which means "I am going about" (some thing.) *N"dallemi mikemosi,* "I am going to work," or "about to work." *N"dallemi wickheen,* "I am going to "build." *N"dallemi angeln,* "I am about dying," or "going to die." The second member of the word, that is to say, *angel,* comes from *angeln,* "to die;" *angloagan,* "death," *angellopannik,* "they are all dead." The remainder is a grammatical form; *atsch,* indicates the future tense; the last syllable *ik,* conveys the idea of the personal pronoun "*they.*" Thus *elumiangellatschik,* like the Latin *morituri,* expresses in one word "they or those

"who are going or about to die," and in German "*Die-*
"*jenigen welche am sterben sind.*"

I am pleased to hear that you discover every day new beauties as you proceed with the study of the Indian languages, and the translation of Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar. You have, no doubt, taken notice of the reciprocal verb exemplified in the fifth conjugation, in the positive and negative forms by "*ahoaltin*," "to love each "other." Permit me to point out to you the regularity of its structure, by merely conjugating one tense of it in the two forms.

INDICATIVE PRESENT.

Positive Form.

N'dahoaltineen, *we love one another.*
K'dahoaltihhimo, *you love one another.*
Ahoaltowak, *they love one another.*

Negative Form.

Matta n'dahoaltiwuneen, *we do not love one another.*
Matta kdahoaltiwihhimo, *you do not love one another.*
Matta ahoaltiwiwak, *they do not love one another.*

You will find the whole verb conjugated in Zeisberger, therefore I shall not exemplify further. You see there is no singular voice in this verb, nor is it susceptible of it, as it never implies the act of a single person. In the negative form, "matta" or "atta" is an adverb which signifies "no" or "not," and is always prefixed; but it is not that alone which indicates the negative sense of the verb. It is also pointed out by *wu* or *wi*, which you find interwoven throughout the whole conjugation, the vowel immediately preceding being sometimes changed for the sake of sound, as from "aholtawak," they love "each other," is formed "ahoaltiwiwak," "they do not "love each other."

I will point out further, if you have not already observed it, what I am sure you will think a grammatical

curiosity; it is a concordance in tense of the adverb with the verb. Turn to the future of the same negative conjugation in Zeisberger, and you will find:

Mattatsch n'dahoaltiwuneen, *we shall or will not love each other.*
Mattatsch k'dahoaltiwihhimo, *you* —
Mattatsch ahoaltiwiwak, *they* —

I have said already that *atsch* or *tsch* is a termination which in the conjugation of verbs indicates the future tense. Sometimes it is attached to the verb, as in *matta ktahoaliwitsch*, "thou shalt or wilt not love me," but it may also be affixed to the adverb as you have seen above, by which means a variety is produced which adds much to the beauty and expressiveness of the language.

You have asked me whether the Delaware language has inversions corresponding with those of the Latin? To this question, not being a Latin scholar, I am not competent to give an answer; I can only say that when the Indian is well or elegantly spoken, the words are so arranged that the prominent ideas stand in front of the discourse; but in familiar conversation a different order may sometimes be adopted. We say, in Delaware, *Philadelphia epit*, "Philadelphia at," and not as in English "at Philadelphia." We say "bread give me," and not "give me bread," because *bread* is the principal object with which the speaker means to strike the mind of his hearer.

In the personal forms, or as you call them, *transitions* of the active verbs, the form expressive of the pronoun governed is sometimes placed at the beginning, as in *k'dahoatell*, "I love thee," which is the same as *thee I love*; for *k*, (from *ki*) is the sign of the second person; sometimes, however, the governing pronoun is placed in front, as in *n'dahoala*, "I love him," *n'* being the sign of the first person, I. In these personal forms or transitions, one

of the pronouns, governing or governed, is generally expressed by its proper sign, *n'*, for "I" or "me," *k'* for "thou" or "thee," and *w'* for "he or him;" the other pronoun is expressed by an inflexion, as in *k'dahoalohhumo*, I love you, *k'dahoalineen*, thou lovest us, *k'dahoalawak*, thou lovest them. You may easily perceive that the governing pronoun is not always in the same relative place with the governed.

That these and other forms of the verbs may be better understood, it will not be amiss to say something here of the personal pronouns. They are of two kinds; separable and inseparable. The separable pronouns are these:

Ni, *I.*
Ki, *thou.*
Neka or nekama, *he* or *she.*
Kiluna, *we.*
Kiluwa, *you.*
Nekamawa, *they.*

There are other personal pronouns, which I believe to be peculiar to the Indian languages; such are:

Nepe, *I also.*
Kepe, *thou also.*
Nepena, *or* kepena, *we also.*
Kepewo, *you also.*
Kepoak, *they also.*

The inseparable pronouns are *n* for the first person, *k* for the second, and *w* or *o* for the third, both in the singular and the plural. They are combined with substantives in the possessive forms, as in *nooch*, my father, *kooch*, thy father; the third person is sometimes expressed by the termination *wall*, as *ochwall*, his or her father, and at other times by *w*, as in *wtamochol*, his or her canoe. In the plural, *nochena*, our father, *kochuwa*, your father, *ochuwawall*, their father.

The verbal transitions are compounded of the verb itself, combined with the inseparable pronouns and other forms or inflexions, expressive of time, person, and number. To understand these properly requires attention and study.

These things are not new to you, but they may be of use to those members of the Committee who have not, like yourself, had the opportunity of studying a grammar of this language. I am, &c.

LETTER XXII.

FROM THE SAME.

Bethlehem, 27th August, 1816.

Dear Sir—I promised you in one of my former letters that I would write to a gentleman well acquainted with the Chippeway language, to ascertain whether it is true, as Professor Vater asserts, that it is almost without any grammatical forms. I wrote in consequence to the Rev. Mr. Dencke, a respectable Missionary of the Society of the United Brethren, who resides at Fairfield in Upper Canada, and I have the pleasure of communicating to you an extract from his answers to the different questions which my letter contained.

EXTRACT.

1. "According to my humble opinion, and limited "knowledge of the Indian languages, being chiefly ac- "quainted with the Delaware and Chippeway, of which "alone I can speak with propriety, those two idioms are "of one and the same grammatical structure, and rich "in forms. I am inclined to believe that Mr. Duponceau "is correct in his opinion that the American languages

"in general resemble each other in point of grammatical "construction; for I find in that of Greenland nearly the "same inflections, prefixes, and suffixes, as in the Dela- "ware and the Chippeway. The inflexions of nouns and "conjugations of verbs are the same. The pronominal "accusative is in the same manner incorporated with "the verb, which, in this form, may be properly called "*transitive*. See Crantz's History of Greenland, in Ger- "man, page 283. These forms, though they are very "regular, are most difficult for foreigners to acquire. I "might give examples of conjugations in the various "forms, but as they have not been expressly called for, "I do not think necessary to do it.

"The Greenlanders, it seems, have three numbers in "the conjugation of their verbs, the singular, dual, and "plural; the Delawares and Chippeways have also three, "the singular, the *particular*, and the plural. For in- "stance, in the Delaware language we say in the plural, "*k'pendameneen*," which means "we *all* have heard;" "and in the particular number we say, "*n'pendame-* "*neen*," "we, who are now specially spoken of, (for in- "stance, this company, the white people, the Indians,) "have heard." Upon the whole, Crantz's History of "Greenland has given me a great insight into the con- "struction of the Indian languages; through his aid, I "have been able to find out the so necessary *infinitive* "of each particular verb. By means of the transitions, "Indian verbs have nine or ten different infinitives, "whence we must conclude that it is very difficult to "learn the Indian languages. There is also a peculiari- "ty in them, by means of the duplication of the first syl- "lable, as "*gattopuin*," "to be hungry;" "*gagattop-* "*uin*," to be very hungry.

2. "Carver's Vocabulary of the Chippeway, I be- "lieve is not correct, though I have it not at present be- "fore me.

3. "The numerals in the Chippeway up to ten, are as

"follows. I write them according to the German ortho-
"graphy. 1, Beschik. 2, Nisch. 3, Nisswi. 4, Ne-
"win. 5, Nanán. 6, N'guttiwaswi. 7, Nischschwaswi.
"8, Schwaschwi. 9, Schenk. 20, Quetsch."

Thus far Mr. Dencke. I do not recollect whether I have already explained to you what he says about the "*particular*" number in the conjugation of the Delaware verbs. There is a distinction in the plural forms. "*K'pendameneen*," (*k'* from *kiluna*, "we,") means "generally "we have heard," or "we all have heard," "not intending to allude to a particular number of per-
"sons; in "*n'pendameneen*," the "*n*" comes from "*ni-
"luna*," which means "*we*," in particular, our family, "nation, select body, &c. "*Niluna yu epienk*," "we who "are here assembled," *n'penameneen*, (for *niluna pena-
"meneen*) we see, (we who are together see); *n'penda-
"meneen*, we hear (we who are in this room hear). But "when no discrimination is intended to be made, the "form *kiluna*, or its abridgement *k'* is used. *Kiluna ele-
"napewit*, "we, the Indians" (meaning *all* the Indians); "*kiluna yu enda lauchsienk*, "we all that live upon earth;" "*k'nemeneen sokelange*," we see it rain, (we *all* see it "rain); *k'nemeneen waselehelete*, we *all* see the light, "(we and all who live upon earth see the light.)"

I believe Mr. Zeisberger does not mention this distinction in his Grammar; but he could not say every thing. I am, &c.

LETTER XXIII.

TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 30th August, 1816.

Dear Sir--I thank you for your two favours of the 26th and 27th inst. I am am very much pleased to find from the valuable extract of Mr. Dencke's letter, which you have had the goodness to communicate, that the Chippeways have grammatical forms similar to those of the Delawares. Indeed, as far as my researches have extended, I have found those forms in all the Indian languages from Greenland to Cape Horn. The venerable Eliott's Grammar shews that they exist in the idiom of the New England Indians, as he calls it, which is believed to be that of the Natick tribe. Crantz and Egede prove in the most incontrovertible manner that the language of Greenland is formed on the same *syntactic* or *polysynthetic* model. So are the various dialects of Mexico, as far as I can judge from the Grammars of those languages that are in our Society's library. Indeed, the authors of those Grammars are the first who have noticed the personal forms of the Indian verbs and given them the name of *transitions*. I find from Father Breton's Grammar and Dictionary of the Caribbee language, that those forms exist also in that idiom, and the Abbé Molina, in his excellent History of Chili, has shewn that the Araucanian belongs to the same class of languages. All the genuine specimens that we have seen of the grammatical forms of the Indians from north to south, on the continent and in the islands, exhibit the same general features, and no exception whatever that I know of has yet been discovered. Father Sagard's assertions about the Huron are not founded in fact, and are even disproved by the examples which he adduces, and Mr. Dencke's testimo-

ny is sufficient to counterbalance the naked supposition of Professor Vater that the language of the Chippeways has no forms. Too much praise cannot be given to this learned author for the profound researches that he has made on the subject of American languages with a view to discover the origin of the ancient inhabitants of this continent, but not being on the spot, he had not the same means of ascertaining facts that we possess in this country. Had he lived among us, he would not so easily have been persuaded that there was such a difference between the different languages of the American Indians; that some of them were exceedingly rich in grammatical forms, and appeared to have been framed with the greatest skill, while others were so very poor in that respect that they might be compared to the idioms of the most savage nations in north eastern Asia and Africa.* In Philology, as well as in every other science, authorities ought to be weighed, compared and examined, and no assertion should be lightly believed that is not supported by evident proof faithfully drawn from the original sources.

I do not positively assert that all the languages of the American Indians are formed on the same grammatical construction, but I think I may safely advance that as far as our means of knowledge extend, they appear to be so, and that no proof has yet been adduced to the contrary. When we find so many different idioms, spoken by nations which reside at immense distances from each other, so entirely different in their etymology that there is not the least appearance of a common derivation, yet so strikingly similar in their forms, that one would ima-

* Bey vielen Amerikanischen Sprachen finden wir theils einen so künstlichen und zusammengesetzten bau, und einem so grossen reichthum an grammatischen formen, wie ihn selbst bey dem verbum wenige sprachen der Welt haben: theils scheinen sie so arm an aller grammatischen ausbildung, wie die sprachen der rohesten Völker in Nord-Ost-Asia und in Afrika seyn mögen. *Untersuchungen über Amerikas bevölkerung*, S. 152.

gine the same mind presided over their original formation, we may well suppose that the similarity extends through the whole of the languages of this race of men, at least until we have clear and direct proof to the contrary. It is at any rate, a fact well worthy of investigation, and this point, if it should ever be settled, may throw considerable light on the origin of the primæval inhabitants of this country.

The most generally established opinion seems to be, that the Americans are descended from the Tartars who inhabit the north-easternmost parts of Asia. Would it not be then well worth the while to ascertain this fact by enquiring into the grammatical forms and construction of the languages of those people? The great Empress Catharine employed a learned professor to compile a comparative vocabulary of those languages which are spoken within the vast extent of the Russian Empire. This was but the first step towards a knowledge of the character and affinities of those idioms. If something may be discovered by the mere similarity of words, how much farther may not we proceed by studying and comparing the "plans of men's ideas," and the variety of modes by which they have contrived to give them body and shape through articulate sounds. This I consider to be the most truly philosophical view of human language generally considered, and before we decide upon the Tartar origin of the American Indians, we ought, I think, to study the grammars of the Tartar languages, and ascertain whether their thoughts flow in the same course, and whether their languages are formed by similar associations of ideas, with those of their supposed descendants. If essential differences should be found between them in this respect, I do not see how the hypothesis of Tartar origin could afterwards be maintained.

Professor Vater is of opinion that the language of the Cantabrians, whom we call Biscayans or Basques, a people who inhabit the sea coast at the foot of the Pyrenean mountains, is formed on the same model with that of the

American Indians. We have in our Society's library, a translation into that idiom of Royaumont's History of the Bible. I acknowledge, that by comparing it with the original, I have found sufficient reason to incline in favour of the Professor's assertion. This is a very curious fact, which well deserves to be inquired into. This Basque language, it is to be presumed, was once spoken in a considerable part of the ancient world, and probably branched out into various dialects. How comes it that those polysynthetic forms which distinguish it, have disappeared from all the rest of the continent of Europe, and are only preserved in a single language no longer spoken but by a handful of mountaineers? How comes it that the Celtic which appears no less ancient is so widely different in its grammatical construction? Are we to revive the story of the Atlantis, and believe that the two continents of America and Europe were once connected together? At least, we will not forget that the Biscayans were once great navigators, and that they were among the first who frequented the coasts of Newfoundland.

But let us leave these wild theories, and not lose sight of our object, which is to ascertain facts, and let others afterwards draw inferences from them at their pleasure. In Father Breton's Grammar and Dictionary of the Caribbee language, I have been struck with a fact of a very singular nature. It seems, (and indeed there appears no reason to entertain the least doubt on the subject) that in that idiom the language of the men and that of the women differ in a great degree from each other. This difference does not merely consist in the inflexions or terminations of words, but the words themselves, used by the different sexes, have no kind of resemblance. Thus the men call an enemy *etoucou*, and the women *akani;* a friend in the masculine dialect is *ibaouanale*, in the female *nitignon*. I might adduce a much greater number of examples to shew the difference between these two modes of speaking. It does not,

however, pervade the whole language; sometimes the termination of the words only differs, while in many cases the same words are used exactly alike by both sexes. But those which differ entirely in the two idioms are very numerous, and are in general terms of common use, such as names of parts of the body, or of relationship as father, mother, brother, sister, and many others. It is said a tradition prevails in the Caribbee islands that their nation was once conquered by another people, who put all the males to death and preserved only the females, who retained their national language, and would not adopt that of the conquerors. I am not much disposed to believe this story; the more so as I find similar instances in other idioms of different words being employed by the men and women to express the same thing. Thus among the Othomis, (a Mexican tribe) the men call a brother-in-law *naco*, and the women *namo;* a sister-in-law is called by the men *nabehpo*, and by the women *namuddu*. (Molina's Grammar of the Othomi language, p. 38.) In the Mexican proper, the men add an *e* to the vocative of every proper name, and say *Pedroe* for *Pedro;* while the women leave out the *e* and distinguish the vocative only by an affected pronunciation. (Rincon's Mexican Grammar, p. 6.) It is said also that among the Javanese, there is a language for the nobles and another for the common people.* These are curious facts, and a discovery of their causes would lay open an interesting page of the great hidden book of the history of man.

As I have determined to abstain from every hypothesis, I shall leave it to others to discover and point out the causes of these extraordinary facts; but I shall be obliged to you for informing me whether in any of the Indian languages that you know, there is any such difference of dialect between the two sexes, and in what it

* Among the Mbayas, a nation of Paraguay, it is said that young men and girls, before their marriage, speak a language differing in many respects from that of married men and women. Azara, c. 10.

particularly consists. I cannot believe this story of the conquest of the Caribbee islands and of its producing that variety of language. I find it related by one Davis, an English writer, in whom I place no reliance; for he has pretended to give a Vocabulary of the Caribbee language, which he has evidently taken from Father Breton, without even taking the trouble of substituting the English for the French orthography. Carver acted with more skill in this respect.

I thank you for the explanation which you have given of what Mr. Dencke calls the "*particular* plural," of the Chippeway and Delaware languages, of which I had no idea, as Zeisberger does not make any mention of it. It appears to me that this numerical form of language (if I can so express myself,) is founded in nature, and ought to have its place in a system of Universal Grammar. It is more natural than the Greek dual, which is too limited in its comprehension, while the particular plural expresses more, and may be limited in its application to two, when the context or the subject of the conversation requires it. I find this plural in several of the modern European languages; it is the *nosotros* of the Spanish, the *noi altri* of the Italian, and the French *nous autres*. There is nothing like it in English or German, nor even in the Latin. I am disposed to believe that this form exists also in the Greenland language, and has been improperly called *dual* by those who have written on it. The Abbé Molina speaks also of a Dual in the Araucanian idiom, which he translates by *we two*. But he may have used a term generally known to avoid the explanations which a new one would have required. However this may be, the particular plural is well worthy of notice.

I shall be obliged to you for a translation of the Lord's prayer in the Delaware language, with proper explanations in English. I suspect that in Loskiel is not correct.

In reading some time ago one of the Gospels, (I think, St. Mark's,) in one of the Iroquois dialects, said to be translated by the celebrated chief Captain Brandt, I observed that the word *town* was translated into Indian by the word *Kanada*, and it struck me that the name of the province of *Canada* might probably have been derived from it. I have not been able to procure the book since, but I have now before me a translation of the English common prayer book into the Mohawk, ascribed to the same chief, in which I find these words: "*Ne* KANADA-*gongh konwayatsk Nazareth*," which are the translation of "in a CITY called Nazareth," (Matth. ii. 23.) The termination *gongh* in this word appears evidently to be a grammatical form or inflexion, and *Kanada* is the word which answers for "*city*." I should be glad to know your opinion of this etymology.

I find in Zeisberger's grammar, in the conjugation of one of the forms of the verb *n'peton* "I bring," *n'petagep* in one place, and in another *n'petagunewoakup*, both translated into German by "*sie haben mir gebracht*," "they have brought to me. Are these words synonyma, or is there some difference between them, and which?

I am, &c.

LETTER XXIV.

FROM MR. HECKEWELDER.

Bethlehem, 5th September, 1816.

DEAR SIR—I have received your favour of the 30th ult. I answer it first at the end, and begin with your etymology of the word *Canada*. In looking over some of Mr. Zeisberger's papers, who was well acquainted with the language of the Onondagoes, the principal dialect of the Iroquois, to which nation the Mohawks be-

long, I find he translates the German word *stadt* (town) into the Onondago by "*ganataje.*" Now, as you well know that the Germans sometimes employ the G instead of the K, and the T instead of the D, it is very possible that the word *Kanada* may mean the same thing in some grammatical form of the Mohawk dialect. As you have seen it so employed in Captain Brandt's translation, there cannot be the least doubt about it. This being taken for granted, it is not improbable, that you have hit upon the true etymology of the name *Canada.* For nothing is more certain than what Dr. Wistar once told you on my authority, that the Indians make more use of *particular* than of *generic* words. I found myself under very great embarrassment in consequence of it when I first began to learn the Delaware language. I would point to a tree and ask the Indians how they called it, they would answer an *oak*, an *ash*, a *maple*, as the case might be, so that at last I found in my vocabulary more than a dozen words for the word *tree.* It was a good while before I found out, that when you asked of an Indian the name of a thing, he would always give you the specific and never the generic denomination. So that it is highly probable that the Frenchman who first asked of the Indians in Canada the name of their country, pointing to the spot and to the objects which surrounded him, received for answer *Kanada*, (town or village), and committing the same mistake that I did, believed it to be the name of the whole region, and reported it so to his countrymen, who consequently gave to their newly acquired dominions the name of *Canada.*

I had never heard before I received your letter that there existed a country where the men and the women spoke a different language from each other. It is not the case with the Delawares or any Indian nation that I am acquainted with. The two sexes with them speak exactly the same idiom. The women, indeed, have a kind of lisping or drawling accent, which comes

from their being so constantly with children ; but the language which they speak does not differ in the least from that which is spoken by their husbands and brothers.

The question you ask about *n'petageep* and *n'petagunewoakup*, both of which Zeisberger translates by *sie haben mir gebracht*, is easily answered. The translation is correct in both cases, according to the idiom of the German language, from which alone the ambiguity proceeds. *N'petageep* means "they have brought to me," but in a general sense, and without specifying by whom the thing has been brought. *Es ist mir gebracht worden*, or "it has been brought to me," would have explained this word better, while *n'petagunewoakup* is literally rendered by "*they*," (alluding to particular persons) "have "brought to me," or *sie haben mir gebracht*. You have here another example of the nicely discriminating character of the Indian languages.

I believe I have never told you that the Indians distinguish the genders, animate and inanimate, even in their verbs. *Nolhatton* and *nolhalla*, both mean "*I possess*," but the former can only be used in speaking of the possession of things inanimate, and the latter of living creatures. NOLHATTON *achquiwanissall*, "I have or possess "blankets ;" *cheeli kœcu n'nolhattowi*, "many things I "am possessed of," or "I possess many things ;" *woak nechenaunges nolhallau*, "and I possess a horse," (and a horse I possess). The *u* which you see at the end of the verb *nolhalla*, conveys the idea of the pronoun *him*, so that it is the same as if you said "and a horse I possess *him*." It is the accusative form on which you observed in one of your former letters and is annexed to the *verb* instead ofthe *noun*.

In the verb "*to see*," the same distinction is made between things animate and inanimate. *Newau* "I see," applies only to the former, and *nemen* to the latter. Thus the Delawares say : *lenno newau*, "I see a man ;" *tscholens newau*, "I see a bird ;" *achgook newau*, "I see a

"snake." On the contrary they say, *wiquam nemen*, "I "see a house;" *amochol nemen*, "I see a canoe," &c.

It is the same with other verbs; even when they speak of things lying upon the ground, they distinguish between what has life and what is inanimate; thus they say, *icka* schingieschi*n n'dallemans*, "there lies my beast," (the verb *schingieschin* being only used when speaking of animate things; otherwise they will say: *icka* schingieschen *n'tamahican*, "yonder lies my ax." The *i* or the *e* in the last syllable of the verb, as here used in the third person, constitutes the difference, which indicates that the thing spoken of has or has not life.

It would be too tedious to go through these differences in the various forms which the verb can assume; what I have said will be sufficient to shew the principle and the manner in which this distinction is made.

I inclose a translation of the Lord's Prayer into Delaware, with the English interlined according to your wishes. I am, &c.

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN THE DELAWARE LANGUAGE.

Ki	*Thou*
Wetóchemelenk	*our Father*
talli	*there*
épian	*dwelling*
Awosságame.	*beyond the clouds,*
Machelendásutsch	*magnified or praised be*
Ktellewunsowágan	*thy name*
Ksakimowagan	*thy kingdom*
peyewiketsch	*come on*
Ktelitehewágan	*thy thoughts, will, intention, mind,*
léketsch	*come to pass*
yun	*here*
Achquidhackamike	*upon or all over the earth,*
elgiqui	*the same*

leek	*as it is*
talli	*there*
Awosságame	*in heaven, or beyond the clouds,*
Milineen	*give to us*
eligischquik	*on or through this day*
gunagischuk	*the usual, daily*
Achpoan	*bread,*
woak	*and*
miwelendammauwineen	*forgive to us*
n'tschannauchsowagannéna	*our transgressions* (faults),
elgiqui	*the same as*
niluna	*we* (particular plural) *we who are here*
miwelendammáuwenk	*we mutually forgive them,*
nik	*who or those*
tschetschanilawequéngik	*who have transgressed or injured us* (past participle)
woak	*and*
kátschi	*let not*
n'páwuneen	*us come to that*
li	*that*
achquetschiechtowáganink	*we fall into temptation;* (ink, *into*),
shuckund	*but* (rather)
ktennineen	*keep us free*
untschi	*from*
medhicking.	*all evil*
Alod	*for*
Knihillátamen	*thou claimest*
ksakimowágan*	thy *kingdom*
woak	*and*
ktallewussoágan	*the superior power*

* The *k* which is prefixed to this and the following substantives, conveys the idea of the pronoun *thy;* it is a repetition (as it were) of the beginning of the phrase "for *thine,*" &c. and enforces its meaning. *Ksakimowagan* may be thus dissected: *k*, thy, *sakima*, king or chief, *wagan*, substantive termination, added to *king*, makes *kingdom.*

woak	*and*
ktallowilissowágan	*all magnificence*
ne	*from*
wuntschi	*heretofore*
hallemiwi,	*ever* (always)
Nanne leketsch.	*Amen.* (so be it; so may it come to pass).

LETTER XXV.

TO MR. HECKEWELDER.

Philadelphia, 1st October, 1816.

Dear Sir—Various professional avocations have prevented me from answering sooner your kind letter of the 5th ult. I thank you for the Delaware translation of the Lord's prayer; it does not differ much from that in Loskiel, but the English explanations which you have given add greatly to its value.

The information which your letter contains on the subject of the annexation to the verb of the form or inflexion indicative of the gender, is quite new to me. Though I was already acquainted with the principle on which this takes place, I was not fully aware of the extent of its application. We have already noticed and remarked upon the combination of the pronominal form with the active verb* in "*getannitowit'nquitayala,* I fear God;" in which the pronoun *him* is expressed by the last syllable *ala* or *yala,* so that it is the same as if you said "*God I fear "him,*" in Latin *Deus timeo eum,* and by contraction, *Deus timeum.* With this it is not difficult to pursue the same course or "plan of ideas," by connecting not only the subject pronoun, but its gender, animate or inanimate, with the verbal form. The idea of the sexes, if

* See Letters 8, and 10.

the language admitted of it, might be expressed in the same manner. Thus also Latin words might be compounded on the Delaware plan. If I wished to express in that manner "*I see a lion,*" I would say *leo video eum*, and by contraction *videum;* and if the object was of the feminine gender, I would say *videam*, for *video eam*. The difference between the Latin and the Delaware is that in the former the ideas of the pronoun and its gender are expressed by a *nominal* and in the latter by a *verbal* form. I consider *leonem video*, as a contraction of *leo eum video;* the *n* being interposed between *leo* und *eum*, and the *u* in *eum* left out for euphony's sake. In the same manner *fœminam* appears to me to be contracted from *fœmina eam*;* whence we may, perhaps, conclude that in the formation of different languages, the same ideas have occurred to the minds of those who framed them; but have been differently combined, and consequently differently expressed. Who would have thought that the barbarous idioms of the American savages could have thrown light on the original formation of the noble and elegant language of ancient Rome? Does not this very clearly shew that nothing is indifferent in science, and above all, that we ought by no means to despise what we do not know?

I thought we had exhausted all the verbal forms of the Delaware language, when I accidentally fell upon one which Zeisberger has not mentioned in his grammar, but of which he gives an example in his vocabulary or spell-

* M. Raynouard, in his excellent Researches on the Origin and Formation of the corrupted Roman Language spoken before the year 1000, has sufficiently proved that the French articles *le*, the Spanish *el* and the Italian *il*, are derived from the Latin demonstrative pronoun *ille*, which began about the sixth century to be prefixed to the substantive. Thus they said: Illi *Saxones*, "the Saxons;" Illi *negociatores de Longobardia*, "the Lombard merchants," &c. So natural is the use of the pronominal form to give clearness and precision to language. *Recherches*, &c. p. 39.

ing book. It is a curious combination of the relative pronoun "*what*" or "*that which*" with an active verb, regularly conjugated through the several transitions or personal forms. The author thus conjugates the present of the indicative.

FIRST TRANSITION.

Singular.	*Plural.*
Elan, *what I tell thee,*	ellek, *what I tell you,*
elak, *what I tell him.*	elachgup, *what I tell them.*

SECOND TRANSITION.

Singular.	*Plural.*
Eliyan, *what thou tellest me,*	eliyenk, *what thou tellest us,*
elan, *what thou tellest him.*	elachtup, *what thou tellest them.*

THIRD TRANSITION.

Singular.	*Plural.*
Elit, *what he tells me,*	elquenk, *what he tells us,*
elquon, *what he tells thee,*	elquek, *what he tells you,*
elat, elguk, *what he tells him.*	elatup, elatschi, *what he tells them.*

FOURTH TRANSITION.

Singular.	*Plural.*
Elenk, *what we tell you,*	ellek, *what we tell you,*
elank, *what we tell him.*	elanquik, *what we tell them.*

FIFTH TRANSITION.

Singular.	*Plural.*
Eliyek, *what you tell me,*	eliyenkup, *what you tell us,*
elatup, *what you tell him.*	elaachtitup, *what you tell them.*

SIXTH TRANSITION.

Singular.	*Plural.*
Elink, *what they tell me,*	elgeyenk, *what they tell us,*
elquonnik, *what they tell thee,*	elgeyek, *what they tell you,*
elaachtit, *what they tell him.*	elatschik, *what they tell us.*

Thus I have given myself the pleasure of transcribing this single tense of one of the moods of this beautiful verb, which I find is used also in the sense of "*as I tell thee,*" &c. and is a striking example of the astonishing powers of this part of speech in the Delaware language. Can you tell me where those powers end? Is there any thing which a Delaware verb will not express in some form or other? I am no longer astonished to find that Mr. Zeisberger has not displayed in his grammar all the richness of this idiom. A single verb, with its various forms and transitions, would almost fill a volume, and there are no less than eight conjugations, all of which were to be explained and illustrated by examples!

But it is not in the verbs alone that consist the beauties of this language. The other parts of speech also claim our attention. There I find, as well as in the verbs, forms and combinations of which I had not before conceived an idea. For instance, Zeisberger tells us that there are nouns substantive in the Delaware which have a *passive mood!* Strange as this may appear to those who are unacquainted with Indian forms, it is nevertheless a fact which cannot be denied; for our author gives us several examples of this *passive noun,* all ending with the substantive termination *wagan,* which, as you have informed me, corresponds with the English *ness,* in "happiness," and the German *heit* or *keit,* in the numerous words ending with these syllables. Permit me to select some of the examples given by Zeisberger.

Machelemuxowagan, *honour, the being honoured.*
Gettemagelemuxowagan, *the receiving favour, mercy, tenderness.*
Mamschalgussiwagan, *the being held in remembrance.*
Witahemgussowagan, *the being assisted or helped.*
Mamintochimgussowagan, *the being esteemed.*
Wulakenimgussowagan, *the being praised.*
Machelemoachgenimgussowagan, *the receiving honour and praise.*
Amangachgenimgussowagan, *the being raised or elevated by praise.*
Schingalgussowagan, *the being hated.*
Mamachtschimgussowagan, *the being insulted.*

You will, I am afraid, be disposed to think that we have changed places, and that I am presuming to give you instruction in the Delaware language; but I am only repeating to you the lessons that I have learned from Zeisberger, to save you the trouble of explaining what I can obtain from another source; to be corrected, if I have committed mistakes, and to receive from you the information which my author does not give. Besides, as our correspondence is intended for the use of the Historical Committee, my occasional extracts from Zeisberger, and the observations to which they give rise, are addressed to them as well as to you, and under your correction, may contribute to give them a clearer idea of the forms of the Indian languages. Our letters thus form a kind of epistolary conference between the scholar and his master, held before a learned body, who profit even by the ignorance of the student, as it draws fuller and more luminous explanations from the teacher. Had I proceeded otherwise, your task would have been much more laborious and troublesome, and it would have been ungenerous to have exacted it from you.

In this manner I have relieved you from the trouble of explaining the *passive substantives* of Zeisberger, unless I

should have mistaken his meaning, in which case, you will, of course set me right. But this author does not tell us whether there are on the other hand *active substantives*, such as "*the honouring*," "*the favouring*," "*the remembering*," "*the praising*," "*the insulting*," "*the hating*." Here I beg you will be so good as to supply his deficiency, and explain what he has left unexplained.

I find also that there are diminutive words in the Delaware, as in the Italian, such as *lennotit*, a little man, (from *lenno*); *amementit*, a little child, (from *amemens*); *wiquames*, a little house, (from *wiquam*), &c. Pray, are there also augmentatives? Is there any difference between the diminutive terminations *tit* and *es*, and what is it?

I have been told that you intend soon to visit Philadelphia; I shall rejoice to find it true, and to form a personal acquaintance with you, which, I hope, will produce a lasting friendship. I am, &c.

LETTER XXVI.

FROM MR. HECKEWELDER.

Bethlehem, 10*th October*, 1816.

DEAR SIR—I have hesitated whether I should answer your favour of the 1st inst. being very soon to set out for Philadelphia, where I shall be able to explain to you verbally every thing that you wish to know in a much better manner than I can do in writing. As there are, however, but few questions in your letter, and those easily answered, I sit down to satisfy your enquiry, which will for the present close our correspondence. If you think proper to resume it after my return to this place, you will find me as ready as ever to continue our Indian disquisitions.

In the first place, it cannot, I think, properly be said that substantives in general in the Delaware language have a passive mood; but there are substantives which express a passive situation, like those which you have cited, after Mr. Zeisberger. I do not know of any words which express the same thing *actively*, except the infinitives of active verbs, which are in that case substantively used. Such are,

Shingalgundin, *to hate;* or *the hating.*
Machelemuxundin, *to honour;* or *the honouring.*
Mamachkimgundin, *to insult* (by words); or *the insulting.*

The diminutive forms in the Indian are *tit* and *es;* the former is generally applied to animate, and the latter to inanimate things. Thus we say *lennotit,* a little man; *amementit,* a little child; *wiquames,* a small house; and *amocholes,* a small canoe. This rule does not hold, however, in all cases; for the little fawn of a deer, although animate, is called *mamalis,* and a little dog among the Minsi is called *allumes,* (from *allum,* a dog). *Chis* or *ches,* is also a diminutive termination, which is sometimes applied to beasts; *achtochis* and *achtoches,* "a small "deer."

Augmentatives are compounded from the word *chingue,* which signifies large; and sometimes the two words are separately used.

Chingue, *or* m'chingue puschis, *a large cat.*
Chingewileno (for *chingue lenno*), *a tall stout man.*
Chingotæney (for *chingue otæney*), *a large town.*
Chingi wiquam, *a large house.*
Chingamochol, *a large canoe.*
Chingachgook, *a large snake,* &c.

There are a few augmentatives formed in a different

manner; for instance, from *pachkshican* or *kshican*, "a "knife," are formed *pachkschicanes*, "a small knife," and *m'chonschicanes*, "a large knife;" still it is easy to see that *m'chon*, in the latter word is derived from *chingue*, large or great, which, with a little variation, brings it within the same rule with the others.

You have, no doubt, observed in Zeisberger the terminations *ink* and *unk*, which express the idea of locality, coupled with a substantive, as for instance:

Utenink, *or* otænink, *from* otæney, *a town; in the town.*
Utenink n'da, *I am going to town*, or *into the town.*
Utenink noom, *I am coming from within the town.*
Sipunk, (*from* sipo) *to* or *into the river.*
M'bink, (*from* m'bi) *in the water.*
Hakink, (*from* hacki) *in* or *on the earth.*
Awossagamewunk, (*from* awossageme), *in heaven.*
Wachtschunk n'da, *I am going up the hill.*
Wachtschunk noom, *I come from the hill.*
Hitgunk, *on* or *to the tree.*
Ochunk, *at his father's.*

As you must have observed that many of our Indian names of places end with one or other of these terminations, such as *Minisink*, *Moyamensing*, *Passyunk*, &c. you will understand that all these names are in what we might call the *local* case, which accounts for the great number of those which end in this manner.

I beg you will not write to me any more for the present, as I do not know how soon I may have the pleasure of seeing you. I anticipate great satisfaction from your acquaintance, and hope it will be improved into a true *Indian* friendship. I am, &c.

J. HECKEWELDER.

054786

No. III.

WORDS, PHRASES,

AND

SHORT DIALOGUES,

IN THE LANGUAGE OF THE LENNI LENAPE, OR DELAWARE INDIANS.

BY

THE REV. JOHN HECKEWELDER,

OF BETHLEHEM.

, 05478 a-c

Upon the whole, we cannot refrain from offering our Governors our most humble & heartfelt thanks to the Librarian Society for the invaluable Treasures of Indian Lore which they have this present made

The Friends of Poems desire the use great [illegible] on this case: & we trust the evening [illegible] Friends will [illegible]

DC
A512td
1819